

JPRS-EPS-84-112

11 September 1984

East Europe Report

POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

11 September 1984

EAST EUROPE REPORT
POLITICAL, SOCIOLOGICAL AND MILITARY AFFAIRS

CONTENTS

BULGARIA

| | |
|--|---|
| Certain Negative Effects of Emancipation Outlined (Sonya Bakish; POGLED, 30 Jul 84) | 1 |
| General Mitkov Reviews Book by Defense Minister Daburov (Mitko Mitkov; NARODNA ARMIYA, 20 Jul 84) | 5 |

HUNGARY

| | |
|---|----|
| Banned Writer's Speech Published (Sandor Csorri; TISZATAJ, Jun 84) | 10 |
|---|----|

POLAND

| | |
|--|----|
| Discussion on Party Structure Related (PROBLEMY MARKSIZMU-LEWINSZMU, No 2, Apr-Jun 84) | 14 |
| Air Force Commander Help Celebrate Journal's Anniversary (SKRZYTDLATA POLSKA, No 24, 10 Jun 84) | 59 |
| Official Press Agency Characterized (Janusz Roszkowski Interview; RZECZPOSPOLITA, 20 Jul 84) | 61 |

YUGOSLAVIA

| | |
|---|----|
| Croatia Discusses, Prepares for Constitutional Changes (Zeljko Kruselj; DANAS, 24 Jul 84) | 65 |
| Serbia's Youth Paper Mocks Critic of Political Aphorisms (Mirko Mlakar; OMLADINSKE, 24 Jun 84) | 71 |
| Prvoslav Ralic Discusses Youth Problems (Prvoslav Ralic; SOCIJALIZAM, No 5, May 84) | 74 |
| Zagreb University Students' Political Passivity Examined (Milan Jaksic; VJESNIK, 5 Aug 84) | 90 |

CERTAIN NEGATIVE EFFECTS OF EMANCIPATION OUTLINED

Sofia POGLED in Bulgarian 30 Jul 84 p 3

[Article by Sonya Bakish, former editor of ZHENATA DNES (THE WOMAN TODAY), wife of Stanko Todorov, Politburo member and chairman of the National Assembly Presidium: "Does Being in a Great Hurry Lead to the Top?"]

[Text] It is possible to talk endlessly and convincingly about the incredible transformation in women's destinies during the years of people's government, about the heights they have attained. However, I am not going to remind you now either of the significant successes or the generous social acquisitions.

The question of why the avalanche of emancipation has caught us so unprepared is on my mind. It happens that now we have to suffer, as persons and as a society, from its unfavorable consequences.

Most of the women born during the socialist years understand emancipation as a sacred right of personal freedom and independence of personality. However, because for many of them the benefits came as a gift, they do not always relate them to their own duties and responsibilities.

The aspiration of young people to be new and different is a legitimate one. To reject what is old and out-of-date. But is it always clear to them what being a truly emancipated individual means, observed in its depth, power, and multitude of hues? Because equality, besides being a fact of social management, is also a moral, cultural, and psychological model. It consists not only of rights but also noble restrictions which every accomplished person should impose on himself.

Do we lead a young girl at a very early age to the realization that she is a woman in the making? And that this already predetermines her path and responsibilities? I think that we do not always do this correctly and intelligently. Now it happens that quite a few girls, as early as the age of 15-16, wade into the muddiness of misunderstood "modernism," and sometimes they pay for it with psychological and physical traumas: promiscuous sexual intercourse, a great number of abortions, venereal diseases, unwed pregnancies, thoughtless divorces, commonplace infidelities, a confused personal life. And in some cases, prostitution, which is organically alien to our social regime.

The waves of urbanization, migration, and other phenomena which are inevitable in the modern world have undermined strong Bulgarian traditions of thinking and behavior in those who were unprepared and unstable. Quite a few young men and women find themselves unprotected by moral standards which could regulate their behavior. There is no shortage of bad examples on the part of older people, either.

Vacillating in different directions can be noticed in different types of women, depending on their age, education, marital status, place of residence, ideological immaturity, and so forth. It is worth looking into all this.

Because, as a family and as a society, we have gotten away a little bit, during the first liberated days, and began rejecting every single old model of feminine life. We were right. The new way of life forced us to shake off, at all costs, the negative aspects of the past that were related to conservative thinking, to domestic conservatism, to religious doctrines and superstition. But we were not exactly right either not to stress that reliable virtues, which result from valuable social experience, should be preserved.

It is worth thinking a little bit about this: does not aspiring only to education and a professional career lead young women to distort their future? While the image of family and of motherhood flickers in some distant nebula, left to chance rather than to early preparedness.

I understand and share the aspirations of contemporary women to go beyond the horizon of what is already known or what has been achieved. To seek eagerly the dream of the white swallow.

However, I am afraid of a headlong rush and of tossing about in different directions. I am afraid of this feverish haste to "live." I am afraid of the inability to judge on real and questionable values.

I fear that being in great hurry does not always lead to the top.

Distorted reflections of emancipation creep in from all directions.

Sometimes I look with uneasy tenderness at slender women-children in tight blue jeans, pushed into picking the fruits of life prematurely. I try to understand their thoughts and their behavior. At times I draw back in amazement. The reason why can be found in what Chekhov said about some of the women of his time who dressed in silk, but if "you looked into the souls of such poetic creations . . . you will see an ordinary crocodile."

But what about the reckless rush toward a career? I am disturbed by the "realization" of immature, clever, not very skillful contemporary professional women. They undermine the image of a woman's actual capabilities by their controversial behavior; they nurture old, antifeminist prejudices. As a matter of fact, only the truly capable, energetic, and businesslike

women should be allowed to succeed. Those who combine their professional and family functions successfully.

I am frightened by the self-robery of many young women. By avoiding giving birth, or by being satisfied with having only one child, they lose the great privilege of contributing to the continuation of the human race. Of being reborn spiritually through those whom they bear. Nowadays, motherhood, this unique and accessible way of a woman realizing herself as a human individual, is undervalued in a threatening way by young parents. And by their own parents too. Just think about how, in many cases, it is replaced by surrogate experiences, by insignificant professional achievements which are petty.

I am also disturbed by the creeping disrespect toward men. Why should feminist emancipation be necessarily linked to humiliating the other sex? Men are not the only losers in this respect. Women and society lose too. An insecure, confused, trapped man cannot be a dignified, strong, caring father and husband, a support for his wife and children. Imperceptibly, somehow, a silent animosity settles into many contemporary families. It weakens the domestic background, this safe haven so needed for the woman and the man too.

But what about the concept of some prematurely developed women that becoming equal to men copying their negative aspects? Cynicism, brutality, tomboyishness, smoking without measure, drinking, unscrupulous careerism . . . and much, much more damage to the feminine nature. Because femininity does not mean only a successful hairdo, well-applied makeup, fashionable clothes. These are important, though only external, indicators. True femininity is something far more complex and profound. A natural magic linked to the deep mystery of life. An elusive alloy of tenderness and strength, of profound and delicate spirituality, a genuine treasure of psychological, physical, and aesthetic values, to which everyone bows in awe.

Who will teach us, and when will we recognize the essential difference between freedom and taking liberties; between rights and obligations; between the celebration of love and the hastiness of casual sex; between the fulfillment of professional achievement and the marathon of careerism: and to teach us so many other things, without which a human personality becomes impoverished?

It would not be fair if we fail to admit that misunderstood emancipation is a weak spot not only of young women. It is rather a result of contradictions, which have not yet been mastered, and which accompany us in our headlong rush toward a mature socialist society. And also as a result of the discrepancy that exists between the consciousness of equality and immature spirituality, without which rights obtained cannot be controlled intelligently. And something else too: it is a result of having an unclear idea about exactly what it means to be a genuine socialist individual, which still remains a future ideal.

Yes, we cannot blame only the young! If weeds grow, that means the soil has not always been prepared for growing sprouts.

Let us ask ourselves and the readers a question: What are the general causes and conditions which give rise to and maintain the negative sides of young people's, and even older people's personal behavior? And if we get a candid conversation on the pages of the newspaper, I reserve the right to share some thoughts.

At the beginning, I promised that I would not dwell on either the individual or social progress of women in Bulgaria. But it would not produce a fair portrait of half of the working women of our society if I limit myself to the negative reflections of misunderstood emancipation. What is more, all of our people recognize and respect the contributions of Bulgarian women during the era of people's government. The mighty quickening, which women's love of work, with women's steadfastness and dedication, has provided to socialist construction.

Well-educated, pretty, interesting, and intelligent women, with good professional and social positions, with enviable self-confidence born of equal rights, populate contemporary Bulgaria.

If I dwell on the unfavorable aberrations, it is because I think we need, in an extreme way, deeper and unflinching self-knowledge. Without idealizing and bitter cries about the past, but also without frivolity in regard to the years passing by right now.

And with a realistic assessment: by giving us so much, was something important lost to us by this eagerness for equality?

And most of all, with anxiety about finding equilibrium and harmony in the development of women's personalities.

So that we do not make any mistakes in regard to the future.

12334
CSO: 2200/175

BULGARIA

GENERAL MITKOV REVIEWS BOOK BY DEFENSE MINISTER DZHUROV

Sofia NARODNA ARMIYA in Bulgarian 20 Jul 84 pp 1,2

Article by Lieutenant General Mitko Mitkov, director of the People's Army Main Administration: "Firm Faith in the Party's Ideals, Dedicated Struggle for Their Implementation"

Text A new book, titled "With Faith and a Sword Through the Years," the collected works of BCP Politburo member and Defense Minister Army General Dobri Dzhurov, has just been published.¹

As is pointed out in the book's preface, the reason for the publication of this collection is to bring to light the author's rich personality, to present a broad view of the stormy development of our sociopolitical life, and the place of the army in this life.

From the heights of Army General Dobri Dzhurov's life's path, one usually looks back to years past to discover the source from which he had drunk thirstily in order to build crystal clear virtues bright faith, and an unquenchable aspiration for the beautiful. This source is the great Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the overall participation in party and class struggles. Dobri Dzhurov became affiliated with this doctrine and these struggles when he was still young, by joining the ranks of the Workers Youth Union and affirming himself as a faithful and loyal combatant for the cause of socialism and communism, experienced party functionary, organizer of the armed struggle against monarchical fascism, commander of the famous Chavdar partisan detachment, and later commander of the Chavdar Brigade, and, after 9 September 1944, as a talented and experienced military leader, well-known party, state, and military activist.

The publication of the book by Army General Dobri Dzhurov coincides with the 40th anniversary of the socialist revolution of September and the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Bulgarian People's Army. During those years of building and growth of socialist Bulgaria, Army General Dobri Dzhurov has always been at his post, working tirelessly on forming a new society, strengthening the defense of our country, defending peace.

¹Dzhurov, D., "With Faith and a Sword Through the Years," Sofia: Partizdat, 1984.

Because of all this, a person turns to each new page with excitement, penetrates into the author's thoughts and judgements, to draw knowledge and experience from the source of rich language, collected and preserved over the years.

The book is divided thematically into six parts: "The Past Is Not Forgotten," "We Walked in the Partisan Formation," "A Mature Party Leads Us," "Both an Example and a Banner," "True Guardian of the Socialist Homeland," and "Shoulder to Shoulder, Heart to Heart." Independent of the fact that the contents of the separate parts represent independent elaborations, everything taken as a whole is subordinated to a single idea, to the author's single position on life, which he has followed unwaveringly--faithful and loyal service to the deeds of the party and the people.

This predetermines the revelation of the basic, most characteristic features of the book's contents.

The material is remarkable above all for its theoretical depth and scholarly foundation. The Marxist-Leninist analysis of phenomena and events, the class-party approach to evaluating them, the true and accurate conclusions which the author makes, direct the reader's attention to the most current problems in the development of the country and the army; the material mobilizes and inspires us to creativity and giving our all in the fulfillment of our sacred obligation--the defense of our homeland.

Army General Dobri Dzhurov reviews the leading role of the party as the most important principle in building the Bulgarian People's Army. In stressing the historical importance of the April Plenum of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party (1956) in the development of the party and the country, the author dwells on its immediate reflection on the army. He points out that after preparing and forming the troops, the army was constituted under the direct guidance and invaluable assistance of the party's Central Committee.

The personal services of Comrade Todor Zhivkov were extremely great, as Army General Dobri Dzhurov points out, in creating, elaborating, and realizing the party's April Line. The elaboration of theoretical and practical problems of building, training, and educating the army, building up the defense capabilities of the country, are all connected with this individual. Under his direct leadership, the October Plenum of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party was prepared and conducted in 1958; its resolutions have a programmatic significance for building up our armed forces. The decrees developed by Comrade Todor Zhivkov with wisdom and foresight at the plenum, about increasing the role of army party organizations, about single leadership, about combining persuasion with force, about implementing Lenin's standards of party life in party and state leadership, under

the conditions of military life, and a number of other important questions, serve us even today as immediate instructions for improving the work of the army. It has been pointed out that, as president of the State Committee for Defense and commander-in-chief of the Bulgarian People's Army, Comrade Todor Zhivkov is constantly concerned about improving the organization and structure of the armed forces, about providing the troops with the most recent armament and combat equipment, about providing material, living, and cultural services to them.

Army General Dobri Dzhurov explains the party's increased leading role in the conditions of building mature socialism by developing a number of sociopolitical, military-technical, and ideological factors.

The materials with which Dobri Dzhurov brings to light the growth of single-leadership command, his ideological and military endurance, his readiness to serve the party and the people honestly and faithfully, stand out particularly brightly. "The commander is the main figure in our army," writes Army General Dobri Dzhurov in his piece on the commander authority. "He is a representative of the party in the army. He is given great power, his orders are inviolable. The preparedness and education of his subordinates in time of peace, success in combat in time of war, depend on his activities." The author, by taking into account and analyzing the revolutionary changes in military affairs which have taken place with the expansion of the scientific and technological revolution, reinforces the thought that a great number of significant tasks can be solved only by a knowledgeable and capable commander, by a commander with great authority. The materials have been developed to support the author's thoughts: "High Efficiency in the Work of Commanders and Headquarters," "For the Leninist Style in Officers' Work," To Raise Management to a Higher Level," and others.

Much space in this collection is devoted to the party and political work of the commanders, to political workers, party and Komsomol organizations. Army General Dobri Dzhurov, with his insight and experience as a great party activist, correctly interprets the contemporary party requirements in this area: "To Raise Party Work to the Heights of Contemporary Requirements," "For a Sharp Rise in the Level of Commander-Organizational Work," Komsomol Activity at the Level of Contemporary Requirements." In these and other pieces, the author directs the reader's attention to the most significant and current questions which our party poses for resolution at congresses, conferences, and plenums. The unity of commander-organizational and political activity is an important factor for commanders in their successful renewed creation of the life of the troops. "One of the most beneficial ways of having ideological influence over the soldiers and their involvement," writes Army General Dobri Dzhurov, "is the commander's participation in political and educational work, presenting

papers and lectures on different questions about domestic and foreign party policy. The commander's active participation in political and mass activity raises his importance as a political activist, increases his capability of being familiar with and conducting educational activity."

The author points out that the struggle for decisive strengthening of discipline should occupy a special place in commander-organizational and party-political activity. Military cadres should work out a new point of view for themselves, a new understanding of discipline. The issue is one of such discipline that it overcomes thoughts, feelings, and actions, that it is an essential trait of the soldier, a determining part of his character.

Having himself passed through the trials of class struggle, through the rigorous training of clandestine life and cruel skirmishes with the enemy, having met with mortal peril dozens of times in firing and battles, Army General Dobri Dzhurov writes with particularly strong affection in his book about such fateful events in our history as the April 1876 insurrection, the day of honoring, Khristo Botev and those who perished in the struggle against the Ottoman yoke, capitalism and fascism, and the Second World War, the September insurrection, and others. "I will not forget the deeds of these soldiers who gave their lives for the homeland," we read with excitement his speech at the unveiling of the Monument to the Unknown Soldier. "We keep their memory bright with deep recognition." This is why the Monument to the Unknown Soldier, which is dear to the heart of every Bulgarian, will remain a symbol of the deeds and the sacrifices of the heroes who sacrificed themselves on the altar of the Fatherland.

The soldiers in the Bulgarian People's Army will draw examples of selfless courage and patriotism, loyalty to military duty and the bright ideas of liberty and happiness in our Fatherland, of unshakeable faithfulness to the cause of socialism.

Warmth, brotherly love, awe in the face of deeds and sacrifices fill each line of the material in which Army General Dobri Dzhurov writes about his combat comrades and collaborators from the time of armed struggle against monarchical fascism. The names of Stoimen Anglekov, "Lenki" Ivan Shanev, "Mitroto;" Stefan Kutsarov, "St'opa;" Nikola Nikolov, "Karadzhata;" Gospodin Gospodinov; Bogdan Atanasov, "Stanko" continue to live in the hearts of the generations because of their rich personalities, beautiful virtues of ordinary combatants for the revolution, or of crystal pure communists.

"An Example, and a Banner," is the title given by Army General Dobri Dzhurov to the fourth section of his book. Here the reader will come across the images of such fascinating professional revolutionaries,

famous party and military activists as Khristo Mikhaylov, Georgi Damyanov, Ivan Mikhaylov, and Trifon Saraliev. The materials devoted to the leader and educator of the Bulgarian people, Georgi Dimitrov, can be read with special interest: "Georgi Dimitrov on Building Up the Bulgarian People's Army and the Armed Defense of Socialism," "Georgi Dimitrov, the Great Son of the Bulgarian People," etc.

For the first time in this chapter the reader will find the speeches made by Army General Dobri Dzhurov, on behalf of the soldiers and the People's Army, on the occasion of the 70th birthday of the general secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party and president of the State Council, Comrade Todor Zhivkov. Each word, each line is a source of sincere affection, respect and recognition--feelings shared by our whole nation for its primary party and state leader.

The combat-forged brotherly friendship between the armies of the countries which participate in the Warsaw Pact, and primarily between our own army and the legendary Soviet Army, have earned a respectful place in this book. "The Soviet Army...has been and is the guardian of socialism and peace," writes Army General Dobri Dzhurov. "Its power is even now a restraining barrier against warmongers. The Soviet Army is the main force of the Warsaw Pact. The armies of the countries which participate in the Warsaw Pact, including the Bulgarian People's Army, gain power by uniting with it and being supported by it."

He points out with pride that we Bulgarians bear in our hearts a brotherly recognition of the army--the liberator of peoples, with whose help the 9 September revolution was victorious. This is why our firm decision and unwavering will is to be always and forever united in peace and war, to strengthen and develop the indestructible Bulgarian-Soviet friendship. United, to move toward the construction of socialism and communism. And together with the other fraternal armies of the Warsaw Pact to carry out our patriotic and international duty courageously and bravely.

The book "With Faith and a Sword Through the Years" reveals for the reader the personality of BCP Politburo member and Defense Minister Army General Dobri Dzhurov. With firm faith in the ideals of the party, with giving one's all to the struggle for its realization, with a "sword" in the hand of the guardian of the people's interests--this is the meaning and content of his life and work.

12334
CSPL 2200/173

BANNED WRITER'S SPEECH PUBLISHED

Sczerv TISZATAJ in Hungarian Jun 84 pp 40-41

Speech by Sándor Cserni, read on 10 April 1984 at the dedication of the László Nagy memorial house: "László Nagy's House"

[Text] As the day of this dedication ceremony was approaching, I became, from hour to hour, more and more anxious. Not because of the task or the responsibility of friendship that I must speak about László Nagy in such a special place and at such a special moment, in front of family, relatives, home-folks and fellow writers, but because of the gut-wrenching pain of talking again about the fact that he is dead. I must say loudly again that he is deceased, gone, that he has ceased to exist forever, and that I felt 6 years ago, on the morning of his death, that this is treason.

What can this superstitious doggedness in me be? The illegal resistance of love and absence against death gaining power? I do not know, but I know that I have a greater need for the secret and for keeping silent than for the naked truth. I have a greater need for imagining László in the midst of the events of the living world than for whispering with the marble angels of the Farkasréti Cemetery. Nor, in the case of a poet such as László Nagy was, the perspective of death can be not only eternity, not only a statue hardened by time, but also a destiny giving inspiration to life again and again.

Those who know him know what I am saying. Near to László Nagy, one felt truer, better, freer. One felt that the world was tense, but also a chosen and worthy place. He thought of fire not only what weakened tourists think, that it is good for cooking meat, but also that it is a human element, a happy or unhappy, meditative, epileptic or a very powerful force, even a faith dwelling in the soul.

Several people standing in the shadow of his lifework have asked me whether László Nagy was an educated poet. Compared to Babits or Ilyés, no. But if educatedness means a familiarity with life, judgment, taste, capacity for pain or joy, then he was unquestionably educated. For who can truly be called an educated poet? I think he who can change the entire existing world into his own world, finding a place in it for the pebble, the rocket and the funeral wreath. With

this very apparent ability of his, László Nagy belongs to the rank of poets such as Balassi, Csokonai, Veresmárti, Attila József and Radnóti. For if Attila József was able to include the entire human world, and even the universe, in his poem about the outskirts of the city, László Nagy--to use a pun--did the same thing with the outskirts of the village.

Most of our poets of peasant origin, from József Erdélyi to István Simon and others, including the young ones, fixed on the social and natural experiences and feelings of a unified peasant world. Juhász and László Nagy broke down the traditional limits and elevated centuries-old peasant life from the earthly world of the potato fields, stall lamps, herd wells and hail to the poetic heights of universal life. László Nagy was the most consistent and crystallized in his work the sensual and objective bonds with the topic. Let us only think of his poems such as "Tale of the Fire and the Hyacinth," "The Green Angel," "Farewell of the Little Horse," "The Peasants," by Seymour is known perhaps to all who are tuned to European culture. I have often thought that the mythical poems mentioned above could be not only worthy companions of this famous Polish novel but, because of the rapid and historic disappearance of the central European peasantry, also an outstanding creation of world literature that has hardly any peer in any language to date and that cannot be written anymore because of vanishing experience. Esenin, arriving from the Russian villages and fields, has written timeless and great poems about the peasant world pushed under the harrow of history. In other words, he picked the autumn crocus and orache in order to say good-bye to them melancholically. For the same reason, László Nagy made dark green forests rumble, reminiscing about the Bible's visages and the murmur of the Greek tragedies of fate.

We should perhaps stop here for a moment. At the time of the Wild Rose litigation of the 1860's, Sándor Károlyi wrote exuberantly to Antal Gaemery, in connection with one of our folk ballads, about a forceful Hungarian balladic tone for which he would willingly exchange all of his novels. This balladic tone has been, and still is, often emerging in our whole culture: in our literature, in our music, and here and there even in our films. I think that, as a new asset, a mythical tone must now be added to this tone, namely one of the principal voices of László Nagy's œuvre.

In traditional societies the concept of home meant nothing but the center of the world, not in a geographical but in an existential sense. Those without a home lived not only without a country but also in the exile of non-existence. Standing here in this peasant yard of the past, I cannot leave it unsaid that László Nagy's poetry developed with the help of this home of his that was built in the world's heart. This is one reason why the house cannot disappear from our view. This is the house from which the roads lead to the field, to the sky, to the fairy tales, to the cemetery, to Somlo, to the Bakony Mountain, to the white wedding of snow storms, and further to the world's countries and seas.

When I learned that Kati Berek would open this dedication ceremony by reciting "The Wedding," I felt the joy of a kind of secret vindication: let the yard's earth hear where its whipping boy ended up; let the Somlo and the Sag hear that he created an indestructible and brand new language from the words learned here at home such as: lark, beat man, horse lather, gout, bishop's cope, and the other 60,000 or 70,000 words! Let them marvel at the poet, who, as a growing boy here at home, was still able only to embrace tough horse necks, but who, as a mature man, already wrote in one of his prose poems: "I believe that I, too, can embrace as Beethoven did!"

Embrace like Beethoven? Unfortunately, some people shy away from him precisely because of such titanic motions. It is mainly the refined estheticians who find this force, this elevated tone, this romanticism full of Baroque-like crowdedness too strong. Of course, they, or their spiritual ancestors, found the same thing in Vorosmarty and even Ady, although they should know that mountains give birth to rocks, not pebbles. Could "The Old Gypsy" have been written without the "Foreword to the Flight of Zalan" or "South Island?" And, similarly could "The Wedding," "Fugitive in Verse," "Balassi's Fever Talk," "The Emblem of the City," or the other great poems of László Nagy have been written, enjoyed popularity been considered outdated, been discarded prematurely? Of course, we will not despair, not even because of the angry and hissing ones, for death puts an end to the work of only bad poets. The work of great poets remains unfinished, to be completed in the spirit of the entire nation, by posterity. And the fastidious and disparaging ones still play an important part in this post-work: they help through their negation. This is why it would not hurt to be fastidious in an objective way and to think a little about how László Nagy's lava-like, keyed-up but still diamond-hard style could develop which they consider at the end of the 20th Century almost as obsolete. They should remember that the policies of the early 1950's (our politics' Iron Age) strive for the total exploitation of man. It is not accidental, then, that it took away his language first: the means of orientation, exchanging ideas and judgment; the language which is the number one condition for individual and social freedom. The young Ferenc Juhász, László Nagy and Margit Szecsi were the ones who rebelled at that time against this earth-scorching dictatorship. They replaced this gray and mutilated language with a rich, exulted and energetic one. Without their linguistic revolution, everything would have happened, and would still be happening, differently in our literature. But as a new kind of language can be developed only where a new kind of morality penetrates reality, László Nagy, in addition to accepting responsibility for the language, also accepted a moral responsibility: the accumulated moral concerns of almost an entire literature: he did this unnoticed but, in a certain aspect, out of necessity. Even if his work was hardened more than necessary by discipline, it immaculately preserved its authenticity. The most beautiful and most suspenseful adventure of László Nagy was precisely his loyalty. He

was able to remain a true man and a true poet in a very difficult period, in the decades of spiritual and moral crisis. Was any one of us a hero of greater adventures?

The house, which is the birthplace and home of two such poets as László Nagy and István Agh, is in itself a respectable place in our country. But for all the good fame, name and nice respect, that the ones starting there have already attained in Hungarian literature, let this house, this memorial house of László Nagy, be Hungary's respected and precious relic.

94.4

CsO: 2500/398

DISCUSSION ON PARTY STRUCTURE RELATED

Warsaw PROBLEMY MARKSIZMU-LENINIZMU in Polish No 2, Apr-Jun 84 pp 140-183

["Authorized texts" of speeches made in conjunction with the discussion organized by the editors of PROBLEMY MARKSIZMU-LENINIZMU on Edward Erasmus's book "Spor o kształcie partii" [A Discussion of Party Structure]]

[Text] Speech by Stanislaw Rainko

Edward Erasmus's book "Spor o kształcie partii" is worthy of serious discussion from every point of view. In the first place, it is a work rich in content. Moreover, it summarizes the various discussions that have taken place in recent years in Poland on the party and its place and role in socialist society.

These are merely a few of its important values. The methodological aspects of the work are also worthy of emphasis. The book avoids various kinds of pitfalls that threaten the researcher of such a theoretically complex and ideologically heavy set of issues.

In my address, I would like to make reference only to a few of the author's ideas.

1. I will begin with some attempt to structure the rich area covered by Marxist-Leninist party issues. Here I am inclined to identify at least three major groups of issues.

The first of these is without question the party-working class relationship. It takes no particular depth to explain this relationship. It is something permanent characterizing the situation of the party both in presocialist and socialist societies. This relationship validates the very fact of the party's existence as the leading and leadership force of the working class, as well as its need to be this force.

At the same time, this relationship has its constants and its historically changing variables. The party always leads the working class, and the working class is the basic organizational unit defining the goals and tasks of the party. This invariant structure will manifest itself differently under conditions of a working-class struggle over independence than under conditions of socialist societies.

Thus, it is unquestionable that this entire set of issues ought to be studied in flux and historical change.

A certain new and important circumstance is noteworthy at present in this regard. Namely, the make-up and structure of the working class are changing before our eyes. Extremely important shifts are taking place. The classical worker (certainly the worker of the entire 19th century) supports himself by selling his manpower. At present, however, in conjunction with revolutionary changes made in engineering and technology, to a greater and greater extent, groups of technicians, engineers and researchers working to serve the needs of industry and harnessed to its mechanism are entering production. Like the traditional worker, these groups fall into the category of hired labor and support themselves by selling their manpower. This manpower, however, is neither exclusively nor even primarily their physical capacity to work, but it is their intellectual skill, their organizational abilities and the like acquired generally as a result of many years of training and often assuming scientific knowledge of the highest levels.

Clearly, such conditions cause us to view certain traditional party tasks from a new perspective. This concerns, for example, such tasks as the "bringing" of socialist awareness into the movement. Under no circumstances can this reduce itself to sheer agitation. More appropriate tools here are dialogue and discussion, the unmasking of the illusions of the bourgeois consciousness and the like. Surely, in this process the aforementioned groups will be more of a partner and part than the target of ideological moves. Moreover, the awareness of this situation is becoming more and more widespread. However, it is not always expressed adequately, as the recent discussions surrounding the phenomena of so-called eurocommunism show.

A second vast area of party-related issues arises in conjunction with the entry of socialist societies into history. It concerns the analysis of the relationship: party versus socialist reality.

Here let us identify only the major elements that make up this new situation. In presocialist societies, the party is present primarily as a critical and revolutionary force whose calling is to bring down the existing institutional and class order. At present, however, the party is faced with tasks of a markedly creative and positive nature corresponding to the structure of the newly created socialist reality.

The working class continues to be the major point of reference for the party. However, its relationship with other social groups cannot be ignored. Henceforth the party operates within the sphere of the entire society of citizens with its ever changing structure.

Along with the socialization of the means of production, the field of materials production is becoming a subject of special responsibility. Under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party, socialism likewise must establish its authority in this field. This is a historic task on whose performance hangs the fate of competition with the capitalists.

The sphere of party-socialist state (political society) relations is a separate area. Here the leadership role formula signals problems, but does not resolve them. Social and political practice infuses this formula with concrete content, but it does not close the issue or offer ultimate solutions.

Finally, the last area of research concerns the party in and of itself, as it were. The organizational structure of the party, the principles of its operation, member-leadership relations and the role and place of the party apparatus--these are only a few of the questions that come into play here.

It is clear that they can be studied, clarified and assessed more effectively in light of the two aforementioned groups of issues. The fundamental tasks of a political organization determine its structure. These tasks are linked to external points of reference--to specific organizational units and social structures. Thus, the sequence we have used to list these issues is not merely accidental.

E. Erasmus's book is organized primarily around this last group of issues. In line with the logic of his arguments, however, the author does not ignore the two previously mentioned questions, nor can he ignore them. They act as a basis and point of reference for the discussion of detailed questions on the structural aspects of the party (its "structure" [ksztalt], according to the author's language).

2. The second issue that I would like to address briefly is that of the party's responsibility for the sphere of ideology and the ideological super-structure. This is not a new subject, but it is one to which we certainly must return again and again due to its status and importance.

What is the party's responsibility in the field of ideology? Above all, it is responsible for the presence of ideological institutions. This is a minimal requirement. Ideologies generally do not exist, or at least in a historically lasting way, without suitable institutional support.

Next, the party's duty is to ensure that these institutions are not merely empty shells, but that they perform their tasks according to their calling and designation. The 1970's offer us a lesson in indispensable caution and suspicion in this regard. We know of ideological institutions that have pompous and high-sounding names whose practice has departed markedly from their intended tasks.

The issue is very serious, and in such cases we are faced with much more than the delusions of society. When such situations exist, they are always a source of demoralization with consequences that are difficult to assess. There is never enough time or place to warn against this danger.

It is not the party's task to interfere in substantive discussions between scholars. Such practices, abounding during the Stalinist period, have been sufficiently discredited. Equally dangerous, however, is the other extreme in which the party loses the interest of ideological thought and the fact of its institutional presence or, worse, allows fictions and sham reasons for existence to spread in this area.

The most crucial issue, however, for which the party is absolutely and primarily responsible is the presence of ideological content in the human awareness. This is a task that must be renewed continually. The socialist consciousness is not a simple, automatic outgrowth of the socialist conditions of existence. At the same time, socialism is not possible over the long term without such awareness.

Sometimes we hear that the universal desire for social justice in Poland is the ultimate proof of the general penetration of the socialist consciousness. Nothing is further from the truth! Justice is a universal catchword that is reiterated wherever people have experienced or are experiencing injustice. It has been repeated for centuries and millenia in all of the most crucial social conflicts. Thus, if we take this test seriously, we must assume that the socialist consciousness has been spread for millenia.

We should not shield ourselves with sham realities. Well known occurrences have caused the socialist consciousness to regress in Poland instead of developing and blossoming. This fact must be made known and the struggle for the socialist consciousness must be begun.

3. I have mentioned that those studying party questions are subject to errors in methodology. In conclusion, I would like to say a few words on this issue.

A frequent error is examination of the party founded upon official documents and leaders' statement alone. Meanwhile, researchers should not forget the elementary rule of Marxism (a universal rule of scholarly knowledge as well) that states that one does not judge people, epochs or institutions on the basis of what they think of themselves. On the contrary, what they think of themselves must be explained and deduced (as well as assessed for its truth) premised upon the material existential and essential conditions that are the share of these people, epochs and institutions.

Whoever breaks this rule is subject to illusions of idealism in understanding social reality, regardless of the views he professes openly.

Another error to guard against is that of treating the party as the highest ultimate value. Meanwhile, for the Marxist and the communist, the party is only a historic means to the implementation of the ends that guide it, if the fundamental and most important means.

E. Erasmus's book successfully avoids both of these errors. It treats the party as a definite empirical reality subject to empirical study, as well as the tool of historical changes along the road of the implementation of socialist values.

Speech by Artur Bodnar

Professor E. Erasmus's book, the subject of, or point of departure for, our discussion, was written between 1981 and 1982. It is a useful work that introduces a number of new concepts into party scholarship, in a word, a necessary study. With these words I would also like to express recognition

for its author for the boldness of thought displayed on the pages of his book. It is proof of his critical reflection on the party, reflection embarked upon in the difficult times of the breakdown of the ordinary notions of many social issues, likewise notions of the standards that controlled past party actions. Prof E. Erasmus remains faithful to Leninist communist party theory in his work. At the same time, he verifies this theory in the light of PZPR experiences, always taking an especially critical view of the specific forms assumed by Leninist party theory in the 1970's. They took on the form of directives and norms and served the practice of political intraparty life and intrastate life largely molded by the PZPR as a ruling party. I share the views of Prof E. Erasmus on many of the issues he discusses and evaluated in his book, particularly since his discussion of the Polish working-class party is supported by the general social theory of Marxism.

Historical time, however, could not but leave its mark on the contents presented by the author and on the manner of presentation. With regard to content, neither the author nor any of us had at our disposal a deep enough knowledge of the historical premises underlying the phenomena facing us at the time. This situation makes it necessary to exercise caution in the statement of many thoughts, but sometimes it also causes thinking in empirical categories to be replaced by thinking in normative categories. Secondly, the changeability of the political and social situation in Poland during that period signaled caution in the hypothetical area of the work, particularly where the concretization of a number of ideological statements of a general nature were concerned.

Prof E. Erasmus approached his discussion using the convention of scholarly journalism. This convention is quite valid for expressing views in conjunction with the discussion over the party's structure, when a severe political struggle is taking place and many structures of the party and state administration are weakened by the severity of the struggle. The journalistic convention avoids the rigorism characterizing theoretical discussions and thus, to some extent, likewise frees the author from being responsible for full verifiability and the possibility of substantiating everything he has written. Moreover, it allows for greater flexibility in stating lines of thinking and in the drawing of conclusions. This, too, has its dangers, however, in that it leads to oversimplification, from which this book, like every book, is not free. I would like to note some of these oversimplifications.

Sometimes we are inclined to abuse the term theory to describe scientifically doctrinal assumptions that become the basis of some long-term policy. E. Erasmus writes: "There are theories that function as statements of ideology to justify the political actions of the PZPR and the specific Polish nature of the socialist structure" (p 104). The author has in mind the "theory of the primacy of heavy industry," the "theory of self-governments," the "theory and practice of workers' councils" and the like. Every directive statement can be formulated as a nomological statement. But theory is a set, a system of possible general (strictly general) statements. We abuse the term theory when we say that every political concept is a theory.

Prof E. Erasmus writes that "the party structure (its organizational structure-- parentheses A[rtur] B[odnar]'s) should not emanate from functional structures alone, but primarily from issues structures" (pp 134-135). This remark is valid with regard to the organization of the party apparatus, but the creation of primary or territorial party organizations on this basis would be strange, at the very least (in the USSR this kind of attempt was unsuccessful).

"The socialist system and state do not have to be democratic," (p 242) states E. Erasmus, giving the examples of China or the Cambodia of Pol Pot. The author writes of the latter: "The state there was treated as socialist, but had little in common with democracy" (p 243). In the first place, from the viewpoint of communist ideology, the socialist state must be a democratic state for the hitherto oppressed classes. In the second place, the severity of the class struggle and the degeneration of the structures of authority may deprive this state of its elementary features of democracy, something we realized during the period of the so-called cult of personality. In the third place, history has not freed the communists from respecting elementary moral standards. The genocide committed by the Pol Pot regime disqualified both on a moral and ideological plane all assurances that it was guided by the objectives of communist ideology. Meanwhile, for some, ideological rhetoric is more important than real political considerations.

Let us return, however, to the theoretical-methodological layer of Prof E. Erasmus's book. The narrative structure of the book oscillates between historical description and normative considerations, i.e., between questions of how things are, how they were and how they should be. The author often derives answers to the question of how things should be from a description of how things are and how they were. But he is faced with the dilemma of whether to compare these answers with our doctrines as stated or whether to refer to the given studies. The author does not yield any clearcut solutions on this issue, so that frequently we are left without sufficient explanations of particular phenomena and their determinants. Thus, the author's answers to the question of how things ought to be are not always convincing and they are highly problematical, since they are inadequately fixed, at least contextually, in the concrete history of our country.

Moving on to the issues layer of the work, I would like to consider briefly the discussions of three categories: the party--class--the nation. Prof E. Erasmus deals primarily with an analysis of the first two categories and attempts to answer the question that I myself once raised (see A. Bodnar, "Problemy interpretacji jednosci ideologicznej, ekonomicznej i politycznej" [Problems of the Interpretation of the Unity of Ideology, Economics and Politics] in: W. Nosek (editor), "Jedność ideologiczna, ekonomiczna i polityczna" [Unity of Ideology, Economics and Politics], Warsaw 1979, p 92). I stated that, under the conditions of the socialist country, the working class party is, on the one hand, the organizer of the class political movement and, on the other, the party that exercises authority, engendering natural conflicts in its operation in social life. The practice of the development of socialism demonstrates that the latter function has always predominated, emanating from the exercise of authority that always imposes a series of limitations on the former function. The party, as the organizer of the political movement,

is interested in perceiving reality in a critical manner, i.e., one free from restrictions of a tactical or instrumental nature. On the other hand, the party, in fulfilling its authority, also must ask itself what are the social consequences of this critical view of social affairs that is free from limits and effected for the benefit of the public. Prof E. Erasmus raises these issues broadly in his discussion of the party-class relationship. On the other hand, he does not determine the relationship of both of these categories to a third, very important element--the nation, an extremely vital element under conditions in which the issue concerns the party in the exercise of authority in an outright monopolistic manner in some periods.

Prof E. Erasmus proposes examining the party-class relationship and its broad social environment in sociological categories, although he does this in a restricted manner due to the lack of empirical data, the lack of study findings. In my opinion, this is an ill of a broader nature, but it also prevented Prof E. Erasmus from answering a number of questions posed by him in the work.

The question of the relationship of the aforementioned three categories is related to the question that Prof E. Erasmus often reiterates concerning the articulation of working class interests, a function performed by the party in the processes of articulating the interests of this class. I cannot understand, however, why Prof E. Erasmus claims that the party performs this articulatory function only indirectly. Perhaps it is because the party, in exercising authority in the state, is also responsible for the entire picture of social affairs, something Prof E. Erasmus does not articulate fully in his own thinking. Thus, the party must undertake the function of coordinator and element searching for tactical, immediate compromises and strategic compromises as well between the interests of the various large social groups. With regard to this, the party optimizes the interests of the working class, not on the parochial plane, but on the all-national plane, in view of which it is not always in a position to reckon with its articulatory functions regarding this class. Thus, it must point out the interests of other social groups that it is supposed to take into consideration. This leads to a number of dangers and to the possibility that the party's social functions will become shaken, as the political history of the 1970's shows.

Currently, much is being said about the party's identity. However, we must find this identity within the class dimension; we must define, as precisely as possible, the ultimate social base of the party. From this viewpoint, Prof E. Erasmus treated the issues of party identity too narrowly. He may have done this, however, because an obvious blurring occurred during the 1970's in what constituted the party's social base. There were periods during which it was stated simply that the nation is this social base of the party. Meanwhile, the party's identity has an ideological dimension as well as a social dimension. Dr Stanislaw Rainko mentioned this and noted that we are faced with many thorny problems here. This is so because the party's ideological identity and the credibility of this identity on the intellectual plane ought to mean that the party once again must reflect upon the theoretical system of its collective thought and on its ideological content.

Meanwhile, we find ourselves in a situation where, for the instrumental ends of the exercise of authority, everything that is done in our country within the party framework is called an ideologically correct action that goes into making up the empirical component of our ideology. As a result, a total obliteration has occurred with regard to the boundaries between the tactical moves of the party that often are included in long-term programs and statements of a more general nature, as well as fundamental statements that create our ideology. Thus, there arises the question of how to separate the ideological layer (in its strict connotation) from the layer of assertions arising from the guidance needs of the party, the instrumental, situationally determined layer, for the purposes of properly ordering the collective thought of the party. In my opinion, to this end we in the party must accord the proper status to such concepts as the sociopolitical doctrine of the PZPR, including there many issues that are more than mere ideological questions.

In the ruling party, a conflict often arises in the roles of the party member, as Prof E. Erasmus noted in passing. This conflict reflects upon the quality of social life. The conflict in the roles of the party member may be that sort of conflict faced by a person that is both a party member and an administrative official and, in these capacities, performs various nonparty social roles. Practice demonstrates that this conflict always has been resolved to the detriment of the duties emanating from the party member function and to the advantage of the functions related to the administrative role and other duties, whether in the state, party or another apparatus. This was one of the fundamental sources of the deformation of our party policy in recent years and of the lack of execution of directives by party members. The resolution of these conflicts is linked with the method of organization of authority and with the method of exercising authority in the state, including by the representatives of our party above all. These issues must be discussed separately.

In conclusion I would like to address the issue of the area in which the working class is directly the unit of authority. According to Prof E. Erasmus's interpretation, particularly with regard to the party-class relationship, the working class is the direct policy unit. In my estimation, however, we must seek better substantiated statements in this area. Studies are needed showing which of the working class groups and factions have determined party policy in the final analysis. I have seen unpublished studies that maintain that party policy has been decided by the workers' aristocracy and the ruling group, or the layer that performs leadership services and is tied up with private initiative in one way or another. Given this fact, say these authors, if the party is to be rejuvenated, it must be responsible for the poorer part of the working class. In this they look for faithfulness to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism to be maintained, only they fail to ask themselves who this poor part of the working class is. If we take as our basis the statistical data on earnings and stratification according to earnings, these will be workers in light industry, women and people that are employed in the various auxiliary spheres of production, in the various services sectors. These are layers, working class factions characterized by the most widespread dispersal and by minor importance in roles performed in the total process of social renewal, very vital roles, but minor ones. Thus it is extremely important

that we, in the future, answer in our research the question regarding which working class factions serve as the basis on which the party formulates its catalog of class interests and sets up the list of preferences of these interests.

In my opinion, in our theoretical studies, we also should investigate the extent to which solutions in the economics sphere and the sphere of the organization of management in the socialized sector have impacted thus far on the method of organization of social life and on the development of new phenomena in this life. I suspect that many ideas contained in the work of Prof E. Erasmus have been determined by factors that are apolitical in nature and that solutions in the sphere of the economy and the state administration, in the various fields of organization of social life largely determine the real operation of the party as a ruling party. In my opinion, we should not forget this when we consider the structure of our party in the future as well.

Dr St[anislaw] Rainko stated that the party assumes responsibility for the state of the ideological superstructure of society and indicates the need for actions stimulating and developing Marxist thought in party ranks. He made use of an unfortunate example, however, to illustrate his ideas, namely that of having to note the problem of the decline of the state as an important topic of the group discussion proposed by him. The functions performed at present by the state are of the sort that there are no indications that the foreseeable future will make the death of the state an empirical reality. The state is the instrument of the implementation of the collective will of the ruling class and its allied classes. It is only through the state that the ruling class today preserves the wholeness of society and its functional stability. In the case of the single-nationality state as is the Polish socialist state, this state also implements all aggregate social-national functions.

Let us be guided in state matters by the theoretical reflections of Engels, namely:

In the first place, political authority and thus state authority as well must function in accordance with prevailing social needs and interests; such authority is then enduring (see F. Engels, "Anty-Duhring," Warsaw 1956, p 200):

In the second place, public authority arose and developed in primitive communities as the authority performing four social functions, namely: the directive-normative, the organizational-technical (the techniques of social coexistence), the production and, finally, protection against external danger. These four functions are indispensable for the existence of contemporary society (the nation);

In the third place, the previously noted aspect undoubtedly inclined the classical Marxist writers to use the term "statehood of the communist society" (K. Marx, F. Engels, "Works," Vol 19, p 27, Russian edition).

In discussing the state, we may proceed in one of two ways. First, we may interpret the state primarily as the apparatus of coercion, the apparatus of class pressure. Then we can say that even our Polish state is a half-state.

or that it is not a state in the strict sense of the word (I am using V. I. Lenin's terms in describing the state of Soviet Russia). On the other hand, we may interpret the state primarily as the aggregate organization of society/ the nation and consider the evolution of its organizations and its macrosocial functions.

Almost 10 years ago, I happened to take part in a discussion in which the question was raised whether conditions were ripe for the departure from using the term Soviet state and for the use of a term and concept more suited to the social conditions of the USSR. The answer at that time was no, especially since the concept "state" had become fixed in the historical consciousness as one that was associated with everything that surpassed parochial interests. This particular context is very important when applied to our society. Perhaps the use of the term "state" would have ended if the syndicalistic-self-governing trend launched by the leaders of KSS-KOR [Social Self-Defense Committee KOR] had won out, but this is another issue entirely.

The quality of the ideological superstructure of society and its status quo are dependent upon the working class party, although in Poland the party is not the only unit that forms this superstructure; moreover, this is not the case in any socialist society. Some party writers identify the ideological superstructure and ideology in the broad sense with the social consciousness, or more precisely, with the socialist consciousness of society (see J. Muszynski, "Have the Foundations of Socialism Been Laid in the PRL?" PROBLEMY MARKSIZMU-LENINIZMU, 1983, No 3-4, p 154). I find this to be a basic misconception.

Prof E. Erasmus does not equate the collective party consciousness with the consciousness of society, which is the essence of the discussions of the aforementioned journalists conducted on the hypothetical-normative plane. However, he does outline the directions of theorizing that, if developed, would set in order collective party thought. The party is an organism that is deeply rooted in society; it is subject to society's influence and exerts its own influence upon society as well. The party's impact on the working class and on society is contingent upon the theoretical picture of the state of development of society used by the party. The content of this assessment is very important.

The party needs an honest answer from its theoreticians regarding the stage of socialist development in which our society finds itself and the opportunities for, and limitations on, this development that loom ahead for the next 10 to 20 years. Undoubtedly, Prof E. Erasmus then will be able to write the second volume of the book we are discussing today.

Speech by Ludwik Krasucki

Why am I so heartily in agreement with Professor Edward Erasmus's book, even though it meets only part of my (perhaps overly enthusiastic) expectations? It is because this work is, unfortunately, one of the few successful attempts to rehabilitate intellectually the area of scholarly investigation that was known at one time as "party structure."

According to my knowledge--and as a journalist with more than 30 years of experience in writing about party issues I have witnessed many occurrences and changes in this field--this term has a long and complex history. The precursor of research here (on his own communist party, of course) was Vladimir Lenin. This sounds banal, since Lenin was the precursor of research in many fields; accustomed as we are to ceremonialism and hagiography, for us this is not enough. In this case, however, it means a great deal. V. I. Lenin was the first activist to stand at the helm of authority following the successful communist party revolution and see and justify the need to research it in a scholarly manner "with all the benefit of inventory." To use words never used by him in this form, he insisted on the continual differentiation of the categories "how things are" (soiell) and "how things ought to be" (soielleni). He argued in behalf of the agreeability of addressing all aspects of party work through the use of scholarly analysis, criticism and self-criticism. He called for the uncovering of weaknesses and dangers, neglect and abandonment in every historical situation, especially during periods of clear successes. He proposed that the party be treated as a cognizable, living organism, subject to the general dialectical rules of development, of the unity and struggle of opposites and the conflict of the new and progressive with the old and regressive. He made it known in various ways that the party should change or be renewed as the reality being transformed under its impact changes. He gave an example of the deep conclusions that could be drawn and that must be drawn from data on the make-up of the party, its activist and its authorities. He described the evolution of the features of party-mindedness and of the model of party commitment occurring under the impact of widespread changes in the national situation. He attempted to describe the way in which the party's revolutionary dynamism grapples with the resistance of class opposition and the party's inertia, conservatism, bureaucratic inertia and bureaucratic distinction.

While I do not intend to expand upon this subject, I would like to point out the polemical nature of this aspect of the theoretical and practical work of V. I. Lenin. It is polemical with regard to its tendency (continually arising, and especially prevalent after the victory of Soviet authority and its consolidation in the struggle with counterrevolution and intervention) to describe the party using terms of self-agulation and whitewashing, to place the party on a pedestal and, instead of drawing upon factual assessments derived empirically, to use bureaucratic, essentially bombastic phraseology creating a monumental sculpture of truly statuesque proportions.

Among the questions that tormented V. I. Lenin, the most important were those related to the consequences of transforming the party from a force of consistent opposition to a ruling power, a major force for the destruction of the old order into a major force for the building of the new, a force battered and oppressed by the authorities into a force strengthening authority and likewise forced to resort to methods of state coercion against the opposition.

The Communist party underwent three revolutions: those of 1905-1907, March 1917 and October 1917. At the same time, it went through periods as diverse as the years of the Stalinist reaction and the new wave of revolution characterized by the events on the Lena, the phase of military communism and the NEP phase.

the period of cooperation with the Socialist Revolutionary Left and open confrontation with former allies. There is much evidence that a strong incentive underlying Lenin's precursorial work in the field of party scholarship was his awareness of the compelling need for factual, comprehensive and critical research into what happens to the party in various situations and under various circumstances, into its impact on the transformation of reality and the impact of reality on changes in the party.

Why do I use the term "precursor"? Disregarding the consequences of the passage of the last 60 years in which nothing stayed the same, we must also note that during the time of V. I. Lenin, the party intellectual vanguard did not have available even a part of the tools of knowledge in its possession today for studying the party. The economics of socialism, statistics, sociology and social psychology all were in their infancy by comparison with the enormous possibilities of these disciplines today. The experiences of the party's leading role in revolutionary social change were in their beginnings. The process of development of institutional forms of exercising this role was in the embryonic phase. Thus, the legacy of Lenin is his impressive boldness of thought and his power to see the beginnings, only the beginnings of the enormous wealth of research, not only on one, but on the many communist-type parties. V. I. Lenin made the giant first step in this field.

And then? It is an open secret, but the situation was very different. After the death of V. I. Lenin, there was a discussion in the Bolshevik party on the name to be given to the discipline that would study the party or research party issues. The force of the Leninist model and Lenin's heritage themselves placed the subject on the agenda. However, the anti-Leninist machinery was already in motion. Its impact led to the introduction of the foggy, confining concept of "party structure" (budownictwo partyjne). It added a specific tonal direction to this field and shifted the accent from research to prescriptions and advice. The deformations of the 1930's shifted the accents further. Along with the atmosphere and attributes of the "cult of personality," there appeared strong hagiographical accents that opposed thorough analysis; the "Stalinist" party had to be a monolith, an indomitable structure without blemishes or flaws. An exception to this rule was the monstrously magnified issue of vigilance, of tracking "enemies of the people," the obsession with the omnipresent "infiltration" of enemy and alien forces. In studies on the party, the only permitted field of study was the "base" or the "grassroots." The central level was totally excluded despite Lenin's frequent observations that under democratic centralism, the leadership organs, the "top" exert an especially important influence -- the totality of party life. As Lenin wrote, this is the inevitable price to be paid for the only new type of structure appropriate for the party.

Pardon this lengthy digression, but I do think that it relates directly to "Spot o kultury partii." It does so because we too, in Poland, in the PZPR have undergone and are still undergoing similar dilemmas and complications related to research on the party, if for a considerably shorter period of time and in a moderated form. We, too, have had our period of a successful beginning, the first giant step whose major implementors were Wladyslaw Gomulka and his coworkers during the period up to 1948. No one was more

attached to the PPR [Polish Workers Party] than Wieslaw [Gomulka], no one valued it more and no one battled more forcefully those that saw it as the embodiment of evil. But from these very angles, Wieslaw, not having access to any research tools that arose later, saw and assessed the party in a fresh, realistic and critical way. Beginning with the First PPR Congress, he noted weaknesses, called dilemmas by name and warned against dangers.

With the 1948 turn of events, the tone fundamentally changed. A stilted, artificial way of writing about the party began to prevail. The "sein" and "sollen" categories became completely confused. Numerous elements of hagiography arose whose first symptoms were evident in Roman Zambrowski's speech at the Unification Congress. During the years that followed, party scholarship (or "party structure" research) nonetheless developed. The needs of life and the overwhelming pressure of practice determined this. However, there were countless barriers, restraints and restrictions. Fundamental changes in the CPSU [Soviet Communist Party] and the PZPR were ushered in during 1956 by the 20th Congress and the "Polish October" events.

Many things changed for the better for us. But many active elements of former practices and old habits also remained. The records of WSNS [Higher School of Social Sciences] show an episode that regarded the administrative halting of the work of the team that courageously worked on this issue. Apart from the inponderables that had their impact, a decisive factor was the fear of adding to the tools of party research the methods of the rapidly developing empirical sociology, as well as the desire to conceal analyses and assessments and mistrust of scientific methods that were not routine, and especially of unorthodox criteria. The first secretary of the time, a broad scale activist, was enamored of cottage-industry methods on this question.

After December 1970, research continued to expand, but its growth was slower and met with much resistance. The brakes still were on, but they were a different set, since the times, the conditions and the characteristics of those making decisions all were different.

All this was reflected in journalism on party subjects in which penetrating, ambitiously cognitive texts that pointed up important issues sat side by side sometimes with articles that were typical whitewashes or works of misguided faith in the effectiveness of empty platitudes. This was the situation upon the arrival of August 1980 and the stormy cycle of ensuing events.

I have explained my first reason for sympathizing with Erasmus's book--the fact that it belongs to that current of party research that harks back to the Leninist tradition of penetrating study, criticism and the differentiation of what "is" from what "ought to be." Now for my second reason. It is that E. Erasmus, based in the renewal, did not yield to the emotions of 1980-1982, that he did not follow uncritically the current fashion for changing diametrically signs and colors. Carefully moving forward, he did not cross the boundaries beyond which the sphere of the negation of permanent principles and the experiences of our movement--the party of the new type--extends.

It is not my intention to give undue praise to the author, especially since the work is its own defense. Preserving all sense of proportion, however, I would like to note that E. Erasmus proceeded in the same way as the major party forces in the discussion that preceded the Ninth Congress and in the same way as the Ninth Congress itself. He did not hesitate to call by name not only ills, but their many causes as well; he ventured into artificially taboo realms and made use of the tools of criticism. He did all of this, however, not in opposition to the party, but for the party, not in opposition to democratic centralism, but for democratic centralism, not in the name of capitulation, but for the purpose of finding ways to bring the real state of the party gradually closer to the model, adapting what "is" to what "ought to be." He went the route of the renewal, but he traveled based on socialist principles of renewal. The book is part of this current, expressing its achievements and its glaring weaknesses.

Of course, E. Erasmus wrote many things that were new for such literature, or that lay unused or forgotten but exist in the Polish and international literature on the subject. Writing in a new way, he was bound to offend the dogmatists with his book (who are generally poor dogmatists in the case of Poland, since for them the obligatory trademark is not the mechanical interpretation of V.I.Lenin, but the laundry is following the deformations of the Stalinist period). Undoubtedly, he would also offend the conservatives that forgot nothing and learned nothing but are prompted by their longing for form and content that were easy and simple, that ensured quasi-order and quasi-calm and allowed routinism and ease to blossom. But they prefer to forget and to say nothing of the fact that this could lead to crisis and that it engendered our painful intraparty drama as an element of the overall drama.

E. Erasmus tells us a great deal about the party in a forceful (sometimes too forceful for my tastes) manner. To say that he does not say a great deal is to forget several facts. First: everything that happens today in the PZPR and in Poland fits into the post-crisis landscape. But words fly away, escaping along with the words that were written in the journalistic heat of previous years, while writings, especially books, remain. We must measure E. Erasmus's book not against the fever of 1980-1982, but against the calm and stability of the years that are before us. In such an atmosphere, the caution, the measure and the internal calm of this book will serve as an argument in support of the enlightened ideas therein contained. Second: the book will "work" during a period when we will be faced with the inevitable threat of the relapse into the old, rather than the chaotic excess of the new. For such is the law of periods of normalcy, including normalcy within the party. I recall that 2 or 3 years after 1956 and 1970 there was already very little talk of renewal and that mistaken conceptions and faulty practices returned in a tidal wave. Within 2 or 3 years of our last shock we have not only the resolutions of the Ninth Congress, the Statute passed by this congress and numerous documents outlining current actions in the direction and spirit of socialist renewal, but also a few books that for a long time to come will support the slogan: "Socialism--yes, perversions--no!" In the area of the party, unfortunately one of the few books of this sort is without question the work of Prof E. Erasmus.

With regard to the part of the book that discusses the party's role, my conclusions run in the same direction, if perhaps somewhat further. They concern the close link between and mutual interdependence of the many elements of factors [as published] of this role that go into making up the structure subject to the dialectical law of unities and the struggle of opposites. Here a marginal note that a typical characteristic of the hagiographical or "monumental" approach to the party as the subject of study is for many authors contempt for, and sometimes the ignoring of, the dialectic.

Interesting! Holding a monopoly on the principled approach and on principled assessments, these authors, speaking out "on behalf" of the Marxist-Leninist party, i.e., guided by dialectical materialism and historical materialism, suddenly exclude the dialectical element. By what right? Are the rules of the dialectic supposed to concern all composite parts of social life except for its major socialist unit, the party? Do not the principles of the dialectic lend themselves to reflections on the structure that, from the ideological and theoretical viewpoint, is the major transmitter of the dialectical method of knowing reality?

These are not rhetorical questions. One also notes many manifestations of antidialectical, real metaphysical thinking on the party in recent years. In texts appearing in the columns of RZECZYWISTOSC and sometimes in SPRAWY I LUDZI (however, in the latter one must note the positive insistence on the class approach to party issues), some authors (including Docent Dr hab Wladzimirz Lebiedzinski and editor Boleslaw Porowski) time and again use an antidialectical comparison to a simplistic ideal instead of a dialectical approach that demands viewing realistically the processes occurring in the party in complex sequences. These are processes that abound in contradictions and are subject to the rule of the shifting of quantitative changes into qualitative changes and necessitate a solid comparison of subsequent real states and the consideration of the total picture of determinants as they really are, "without any extra additives."

Wladzimirz Lebiedzinski--I have given only one example from his prolific writings that are marked by fervor drawn from his mentor--over and over again claims that many PZPR members, including some of the aktiv, are not decisive proponents of the materialistic, scientific world view. But what is really simpler than crying out that the party ought to be 100-percent Marxist-Leninist in terms of world view? Unfortunately, all this leads nowhere. It offers no explanation for why things are as they are; it does not tell us which turns of the historical process and which dialectical characteristics of the social environment associated with the party have impacted upon the presence in the party of many believers or people that are undergoing various phases of the complex process of changes in world view. There is not even any attempt to analyze thoroughly the tendencies that occur in this area and the concrete tasks of the development of the world view of party members, the order of these tasks, their spatial structure, methods of accumulation or the organization of forces needed to implement them. Although the arguments, peppered with quotes, run on for columns, they boil down to an outcry based on complaints and serve as no sort of guideline for reasonable and effective action.

Boleslaw Porowski proceeds in a similar manner on issues of the working-class character of the party and PRON [Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth] practice. On the first issue, this author, very sure of himself, proceeds by crying out "Working-class, working class!" But repeating the word "sugar" does not leave a sweet taste in one's mouth. Calling for the party to be working-class from "A to Z" does not answer the questions that practice stubbornly poses, and not for the first time and not only in the PRL [Polish People's Republic]. For example, how do we guarantee the working-class character of the party, its working-class composition of authorities and the primacy of workers' interests in the party that, acting as the leadership force in the state and playing a key role in wielding power, includes a high percentage of members in the ranks and in the aktiv that belong to the leadership cadres and management cadres? Or, without harming the state, how do we draw the line of demarcation between the position of the party as the major force of ongoing government of the country and the position of the party as the vanguard dutybound to articulate and implement the long-range interests of the working class, to penetrate through the complex of circumstances of time and place with antibureaucratic consistency, with universal ideals and the general law of the socialist system?

On the PRON question, this same author raises an outcry on the subject of the "militancy" of party members active in the movement, the "univocal character" of the views expressed in the PRON forum and the like. These are impressive slogans, but they are far from the realities of a structure that has no opportunity of playing its proper role in the processes of uniting the constructive forces of the nation either as a forum for vying in revolutionary spirit or as a so-called party transmission. If one wishes to be a Marxist-Leninist, one must have at least a cursory knowledge of the wealth of Lenin's ideas on the essence of the class and political alliances that serve to unite people for the cause of socialism, of the notion of creative compromise as an offensive means of class struggle and of the idea of the need for the continual expansion of the "entire system of footbridges and gangways" as a key element of the strategy for winning the trust of the nonparty majority. Without this, outcries serve no purpose other than the desire, dictated by frustration, to demonstrate that one is a "genuine," supposedly better communist than others.

Likewise, another author offers a critical view of reality and includes accurate observations that criticize severely such human traits as cannot be eliminated, and thus must be dealt with. In one of his articles, he complains that, instead of increasing productivity, the Polish worker already thinks in winter about his summer vacation and in general is interested in his wages. It is implied from these arguments that the party is not revolutionary enough since it cannot bring about a situation in which people have become ascetics that do not concern themselves with vacations or the amount of their wages.

Meanwhile, it seems to me that the party has quite different, if related, problems hanging over its head. They include: despite the enormous problems, how are workers to be ensured the possibility of making good use of their vacations and what desires in this direction can be used as an incentive for good work? How can the human desire to earn more be turned towards the benefit of production and management?

E. Erasmus avoids clutter in his book and raises no outcry. His cool and factual analysis, although sometimes complex in form, leads to the elementary, but quite often ignored conclusions that the role of the party is unity, dialectical unity, and thus the opposition of many elements: government, direction and management, leadership, producing an effect and influencing, service, yielding to the control and evaluation of the parent class, working people in general and the full force of making projections and of truly positivistic implementational detailing. It is simultaneously the affirmation and the negation of reality. Without any one of these elements, the party's role cannot be complete, but becomes distorted and deformed. But these elements are opposed to one another. They are not overcome automatically or without conflict, but must be controlled according to a carefully mapped out plan and based on precise sensing devices.

Here I think it is time to come out against the current expression regarding the "strengthening of the party's role" (which means both all and nothing at all) in favor of a simpler idea according to which the party's role ought to be whatever is needed. If it is too minor, in the chain of the interdependence of real social life, this element, that in essence has come into existence to move everything forward, to direct, dynamize and revise all other elements, grows weak. We know today that this is not a theoretical danger, but a real danger, demonstrated by the experiences of the 16 months between August 1980 and December 1981. But what happens if this role is too extensive? It is not true that there is never too much of a good thing. The author of "Spor o kształtu partii" correctly notes that we suffered ill effects a few times when, at the expense of constitutional and statutory rights, in our observing or submitting to the law, ignoring or restricting the systems-type mechanisms of democracy and the identity of working people, in a megalomaniacal sense of the infallibility and exclusivity of our arguments in seeking the comfort of unfettered authority, we "strengthened" the party's role in an anti-Leninist spirit of omnipotence.

What happened to the party? E. Erasmus notes convincingly (if sometimes too delicately) that in practice there developed the ultimately detrimental domination of the apparatus over the party masses and of the informal groups of the "real leadership" over echelons. This led to the unlimited and uncontrolled authority of an individual or of several individuals.

I will not delve into this subject, since E. Erasmus has already done that convincingly. I will merely confine myself to a few reflection on the content of Erasmus's work.

First, let us leave aside utopic conceptions of the party in which every one of the several million members exerts an identical impact on the formulation of the program and the line, on practice and on the selection of solutions and implementational paths. There is no such party. The party needs strong leaders! "Never, leadership strength may be short-term, preceding the eruption of events that are choked out by autocratic means, or it may be long-term, productive socially and politically. In order for the second variant to come into being, from the group of factors that ensure leadership a... we must exclude elements that lead to voluntarism, lack of criticism and self-adulation, leading to the disappearance of self-assessment

and control and, as a result, the inability to revise decisions and ways of acting. Obviously, this demands the appropriate personality traits among those that stand at the head of the party, including the instinct for self-preservation. But this is not enough if a cohesive system of guarantees embedded in democratic centralism is lacking, both in the party and in the active operation of the entire system of socialist democracy.

It is time to come out from under the pressure of the mistaken thought pattern of either a strong leadership or democracy in the party and the state. The correct model is that of a strong leadership owing to the observance of the principles of intraparty and social democracy. The adherents of the return to the totally uncontrolled authority of a group of persons perform for both the leadership and the entire party the most disastrous of services.

Second, there is a direct proportion between ensuring party members and party organizations the possibility of influencing policy on the "macro" scale and the readiness to implement this policy actively. There is no stronger incentive in this area than the feeling of co-authorship. The hard work of discussing patiently draft plans pays off in abundance. It permits becoming familiar with the field of implementation of a planned move by exposing plans to mass party opinion. This is a very representative test of public opinion, its active and dynamic part. Democratic procedure in the party is both the most important system of early warning and the most important system for preparing active forces to overcome various kinds of obstacles along the road of implementation of the given plan.

Let us come out from under the pressure of the mistaken thought pattern of either efficiency, competence and effectiveness or democratic procedure. The correct model is that of efficiency, competence and effectiveness owing to democratic procedure.

Third, there is a close interdependence between the authenticity of the machinery of democratic centralism and the party's ideological maturity and offensive stance. Let us give no credit to the naive stories, to the recurring impression that the ideological consciousness and the offensive stance of the party can be achieved by putting millions of its members at school desks, even in a situation that is organized in an exemplary manner. Schooling--yes, but that is not all.

The party is not an organization of the cadets of Marxism-Leninism, but a group of active participants in social, political and economic life, in ideological struggle and in confrontation of the old and the new. The party member is properly trained if the flow of knowledge that is transmitted to him falls upon the fertile soil of his social experiences.

The most important premise underlying the receptivity of the party member to the flow of Marxist-Leninist ideological sustenance is the persistent aim for the practice of one's own organization and the entire party to create incentives that foster this. In a party commanded and directed primarily through methods of discipline over methods of explanation, through monologue over discussion, through truths over assessments and assumptions that are arrived at jointly, these incentives weaken and disappear.

Let us come out from under the pressure of the mistaken pattern of either ideological awareness and an offensive stance or the broad scope of consultation, discussion and grassroots control and criticism. The correct model is that of ideological awareness and an offensive stance owing to the development of democratic practice in the party.

Fourth, in the discussion of the important subject of the full-time party apparatus, many statements have been made that are correct, if unpleasant, and twice as many are misleading. In my opinion, E. Erasmus puts the issue intelligently. But I fail to note in his work a very crucial idea in this objectively very complex and subjectively extremely touchy question. It is the question of the kind of party determining the kind of apparatus. To put it another way: whatever the direction of the evolution of party life, of its role and of the way this role is exercised, that will be the direction of both the selection of party workers and of the molding of their views. It also will determine how effective these areas will be.

Show me the party apparatus and I will tell you all about the party per se--this is the idea I propose against the background of E. Erasmus's work. I believe it to be a valid and just idea. It takes away from the apparatus and its employees credit for contributions they have not made, but it also lifts blame for those things that are not their responsibility. The relationship between the whole and the part is expressed in the proper manner, and the cart is not put before the horse... Every party committee headquarters is a mirror that reflects the actual party status quo.

Let us come out from under the pressure of the pattern of either democracy in the party or an efficient apparatus. The correct idea is that of intra-party democracy and an efficient apparatus as one of its conditions and tools.

Let us now go to the question that I consider to be the most important one. I would like to point out the special link between the overall analysis of the party made by E. Erasmus and a key aspect of its role and operation: the link with the parent working class and society, the capacity to express and implement the interests of workers, working people, to serve productively the forces that have brought the party into existence and without whose support it can be only a sect of people with noble intentions but people that are misunderstood or a collection of pretenders that do not possess a mandate from those that they represent.

The PRL Constitution speaks of "the authority of the working people of cities and villages" and of "the leading role of the PZPR." The party is made up of only a small percentage of the working people of cities and villages. Are these conflicting statements, or does one cancel out the other? Such a conflict may arise--and it is explosive in nature and may lead to a crisis--if the party weakens or loses its ties with its class base, with its social supply base. This conflict can be avoided if the party is linked strongly to this base, this supply line, is concerned about this link and continually renews it.

Obviously, this depends upon many factors. One is especially important, however, and it is on the analysis of this factor above all that E. Erasmus builds a significant part of his work. This factor is the active, subjective, documented role, continually implemented in practice, of those party forces that operate in the front line of work and life and are rooted in the masses, being a part of them in no way separated from the whole. In other words, they are primary party organizations, or workers and farmers, or members of the intelligentsia that do not perform leadership functions but work at the same levels as others and under the same conditions in institutions, offices, schools, scientific research centers, cultural centers and the like.

The fullness of the documented and implemented rights of this part of the party is of decisive importance for the link between its leadership staff and the working class, working people that the party leads and serves, serves and leads. The unified interpretation of democratic centralism and practice that complies with this interpretation and concern over the machinery of intraparty democracy that is under the constant threat of bureaucratism are not subjects for the ruminations of crazy aesthetes or fields for the spectacles of ideological cranks, but the most vitally important, key condition for the success of the party and the socialist country. All carelessness and abandonment on this matter avenge themselves immediately or call forth the latent but constantly attacking organism of disease. All actions in this matter lead towards recovery either immediately or over the long term.

At a time when many people long for the pattern of an order--a briefing--the telephone and telegraph, it is well to remember this, even to the point of boredom.

I have presented only a few of the ideas that came to me when I read E. Erasmus's book. I have explained why it has my recognition and sympathies, and why I agree wholeheartedly with the major current of the ideas therein contained.

Briefly, then, allow me to present my quarrels with the author. It is good that he has made use of contemporary methods of statistics, sociology and (if sometimes to a lesser extent) social psychology, that with regard to the sort of structure that is the PZPR, he has used the structural approach in many places and that as a tool of party research, in some places he has used empirical local studies that are valid today. I do not think, however, that this should have reflected upon the language of the work that sometimes is insufferably "academic" (as students use the word).

The author also had to cite many basic ideas that are generally known. These ideas today are of questionable educational value due to the invasion of muddleheadedness and irreputable gossip. In some parts of the book, however, that passionately calls for ties with primary organizations, the working class and society, one comes upon empty words and needlessly pompous declarations. In some places, the convoluted manner of stating the obvious has an unintended comic effect.

These are not merely stylistic drawbacks. They hamper the clarity of the author's argument. Moreover, every instance of abstruseness on issues of such

complexity and sensitivity threatens awkwardness and blunders in language in which the relentless trackers of supposed heresies are only too ready to catch the author. These latter seem to have proliferated of late, although (for E. Erasmus's sake and mine) I hope that they are the byproduct of the turn of events, a phase that will quickly pass. It would have been better if the book had defended itself against the overly zealous tenders of the holy fire through clarity in language and simplicity in argument.

Finally, I would like to propose that the author, when he works on a second edition, expand the parts devoted to the experiences of other parties. The issues discussed in the book are of a universal nature. However, the Polish reader, including the PZPR activist, frequently has the mistaken notion that changes in the PZPR statute and much of what we are doing for the "intraparty renewal" is unprecedented and represents a patented Polish risk. This is not the case. Extensive literature exists regarding the Soviet party, especially from the 1920's and the second half of the 1950's. The changes made in, and the research done on the Bulgarian party in close conjunction with the 20th CPSU Congress are richly documented. There is a wealth of information on the post-1956 experiences in Hungary. Nor is there any lack of creative research on the party in the GDR and Czechoslovakia from the 1970's. Cuban and Vietnamese works treat many important ideas of more general significance, such as questions of the moral attitude of communists. The Yugoslavian and the Chinese experiences also are worth studying.

Not only does the author have the right to use this material, but it provides him with an opportunity of showing the Polish party activist that the problems we are trying to solve here and now have a long and complex history in the international movement and numerous connotations for the present. Although E. Erasmus's book abounds in innovative concepts, it is not the "fruit of all evil," but an installment of the research and investigation that will last as long as does the international communist movement, as long as socialism will be built and improved, a young system subject to reform and continually casting off the shell of dogmatism, as vital as a green tree.

Speech by Jerzy Kucinski

In my address, I will make use of some of the ideas I used in my review of the book under discussion, a review that is as yet unpublished at the time of our discussion here. To get to the heart of the matter, I believe that it is extremely vital for this book to have been written. It is an important voice in the extensive discussion that has been ongoing in recent years on the subject of the party, its role and structure and various related questions. It is likewise important (and this is something I sense quite clearly when reading the book) that it is an outgrowth of the lively currents of discussion on the subject of important political and ideological problems related to the party, of the heated and sometimes bitter reflections on the subject of its role and operation.

The contents of the book are considerably richer than its title suggests, since the author has not limited himself to reconstructing and systematizing the various currents of discussion on the subject of the party that circulated

in Poland after August 1981. The dominant idea in the book regards the party's role and place in society and in the state in general. Prof E. Erasmus analyzes this problem on the basis of the 1970's in People's Poland. It is worth noting the extensive criteria used to assess these years. The most important of these is an analysis of particular issues from the viewpoint of the adaptability of party practice to concrete, objective socio-political conditions. On this basis, Prof E. Erasmus attempts to formulate certain conclusions for today and suggestions for the future. It likewise should be emphasized that these recommendations are not only of a normative nature, but of a practical nature above all, which is for me a virtue of such thinking.

One of the major questions treated by the author of the book is the issue of the methods used by the party to perform its leading and leadership role. The author believes that this is a kind of key to the analysis of changes in the political and economic system. Naturally, this causes the reader to ask the following question: how are we to understand this proper leadership and leading role? The author attempts to answer this question by saying that it is correct when it conforms to the principles set up in Marxist ideology and to the expectations of the working class and the entire society. At first glance this idea poses no problem. However, when we begin to take a closer look at the criteria for the right leadership, certain doubts begin to arise. For example, there is the crucial issue that the working class, spoken of in conjunction with the criterion of "leading through the party," is not uniform. This leads us to ask on which layer or group of this class the leadership should be based. Next, as the events of recent years have shown, the views of the working class and its expectations are subject to very rapid change. In this situation, the criterion becomes more "fluid," unclear and unspecified.

There is still another, more basic premise, however, that must be examined. I refer here to questions of a somewhat different nature, namely the issue of political/systems-type principles. If we adopt the view that the principle of democracy is the most important, and that all other principles ought to serve its best and fullest implementation to some degree, then from this viewpoint, the "leadership" criterion ought to be linked up with a request to answer the question: to what extent does the implementation of the party's leading role lead to the growth of the working class identity, to the development of democracy? This question is extremely vital not only for the party itself, but also in a broader context because, as experience shows, attempts to implement other principles may not conform to the realization of the principle of democracy. This is evident, for example, in the published assumptions of the law on electoral law whose closer analysis shows how very difficult it is to reconcile the aim to democratize social life with the simultaneous observation of other basic systems principles.

I note this problem because it is of basic theoretical and practical importance and, moreover, is relatively little studied. I will say, however, that within the circle of Prof E. Erasmus's coworkers, an interesting work appeared recently on the subject of the implementation of the principle of law and order. It includes passages that show how, in a number of instances, a conflict between the principles of law and order and democracy may arise in the course of political practice.

Let us return to the subject. It is difficult to gloss over the fact that some of the author's statements seem somewhat controversial. For example, the author believes that one of the fundamental characteristics of the leading and leadership categories of the party's role is equality between units or components, in Prof E. Erasmus's designation of the political system. In my opinion, there is some question with regard to this. Regardless of the manner in which the partnership structure of relations between political units (especially between parties and organizations of secular catholics, for example) develops, the position of that unit that leads is by definition different from the position of the other elements of the political structure.

In the first chapter of his book, the author ventures far beyond what is stated in his title. I think that it is worthwhile to note the unconventional, but interesting discussion of the causes of the crisis and his original ideas on the social sources of deviation. In this context, the author shares his interesting observations with his readers. After the crisis was overcome or subsided, i.e., after emotions and tensions in society subsided, until now it has been the practice to absolutize the changes made during that time or to recognize them as optimal, almost model or final. I think that here he has perceived a serious problem not only in the past, but also today. Here I avail myself of one of the statements made by the PZPR KC [Central Committee] first secretary contained in his address summarizing the 13th Plenum deliberations. The first secretary said that we must become more fully aware of the current tasks of the second stage of implementation of the Ninth Congress resolutions and that the lifting of martial law demands that we view anew certain elements of the normalization of the situation in Poland and what we ought to derive, as if afresh, from the Ninth Congress resolutions. Then we must embark upon the implementation of these recommendations under new circumstances.

Another problem worth considering is that of the relationship between the party's consciousness-raising of the working class and the party's recording of the impulses issuing from this class. Prof E. Erasmus, assuming that this is a historically changeable phenomenon, that in various periods this relationship takes different shapes, has proposed the grasp of this question suitable for present Polish conditions.

Much attention has been given in Erasmus's book to issues of the intraparty democracy treated as a definite model for the representative and direct democracy. The author notes aptly that in recent years (before the August crisis), the party lacked discussion in the Leninist sense of the word. This was an expression of the decline of important elements and mechanisms of the intraparty democracy. Today we must give these mechanisms a new, active dimension. Here I mean increasing the status of the right of members and party organizations to make recommendations and proposals regarding the party's political program. This right, recorded in the resolutions of the Ninth Congress, does not work as is necessary. The situation is similar with regard to the right and, at the same time, the obligation of the party organization to assess regularly, through the primary organization, those of its members that hold party functions or work in the state apparatus and hold responsible positions there. Thus far, this mechanism of party operation also is not sufficiently utilized.

The author's discussion of the mechanism for electing authorities in the party is especially important. Prof E. Erasmus identifies several models of this mechanism: the centralist, the democratic and the mixed. At the same time, he favors the latter and formulates the opinion that the initiative of selecting, discussion and consulting upon candidates ought to rest equally with superior authorities, POP's [Primary Party Organizations] and local organizations. In the author's opinion, this model is closest to the principles of democratic centralism. In my opinion, however, this position of the author raises doubts. I question his belief that in the phase of nominating candidates, the position of these "grassroots" party members from POP's should be markedly stronger than the position of the candidates proposed by the party authorities. Sociopolitical conditions cannot be an argument on behalf of limiting the democratic principles of party operation, since the results of the centralistic model of party elections generally are unfavorable. We note a disturbing phenomenon during the course of the present electoral campaign: at some gmina conferences often there are no willing candidates for echelon authorities from among workers and peasants. As a consequence, delegates often are the employees of the party or functional apparatus (once again we have the concept of the "functional aktiv").

In his book, E. Erasmus makes many vital remarks concerning the issues of implementing the party's leading role in the state. This is important because in this area, theoretical thinking is, in my opinion, especially poor. From the viewpoint of theory we know how a given model is supposed to look, but practice has not always confirmed this model. On the other hand, with regard to certain specific elements of the state apparatus (e.g., the judiciary and the prosecutor's office), we still have serious problems deciding what role the party is supposed to implement in these elements.

In general, the question of how to implement the party's leading role in the state so as to strengthen the structure of the state apparatus as defined in the Constitution is still a thorny problem. It is important that the party's leading role in practice does not lead to the decline in significance of those organs that occupy a superior position in the entire structure of the state administrative apparatus.

I think that a certain request may be made of the author. That is that some themes of the work that are very interesting but are treated very briefly, ought to be developed. For example, I would like to read more on the subject of the inspirational, integrational, program and mediative functions of the party's leading role. This question has been studied very little among us. Another such subject is the compliance of party resolutions with the law. This is an issue that often is not perceived, but is vitally important. Our experiences in this regard have not been the best. It is generally accepted in practice that the most important "apparatus" after the Politburo is the Government Presidium. This pattern is carried over into the local relations of the organs of party authority and the organs of state authority, and it results in the failure to appreciate representative organs, beginning with the Sejm and the Council of State and ending with the gmina [parish] people's council. I concur with the opinion expressed by Prof A. Bodnar that, after the period of revolutionary changes, when the party itself inspired making written references

to the Constitution, it must bear the consequences of this. This means that its work cannot be out of accord with the binding legal system.

In such a thematically rich work as E. Erasmus' book, written almost "live" at the time of the operation of so many complex processes, of necessity there must be very many themes that raise doubts of all sorts among readers. For example, the author writes that after 1956, the isolation of the authorities increased by comparison with the 1950-1956 period. I think that it is difficult to prove this idea. Despite the fact that there was a certain curbing of the implementation of the proposed reforms, just as in 1957 and after the changes of 1970/1971, there were fundamental changes in the mechanism of the functioning of authority.

At times, one can also quarrel with the author for not always adhering to the particular connotation given in the social sciences for the content of some of the concepts he uses. While this is not necessarily a criticism, where the author does use some concepts in a connotation that is not the usual one, I would like to see a suitable argument justifying such usages.

Any criticism, however, cannot hide the fact that Prof E. Erasmus's book is a very powerful voice in the discussion of the subject of the socialist renewal and the modernization of the political system. It is extremely useful for having been issued at a time of such crucial sociopolitical changes occurring in our country.

Speech by Stanislaw Krzatkowski

I admit that when I set out to read Prof E. Erasmus's book, I was sure that it would be yet another textbook in the field. The issue of party operation in the theoretical sense is an issue frequently raised in our Marxist community. There is a great deal of literature on the subject, particularly of a textbook and exiguous nature. However, I was pleasantly surprised to learn that I had before me a book on very current problems, written as if at the moment that the issues are prevalent. As I flipped through the book once again before this meeting, I became convinced that it had lost none of its currency, despite the many sweeping changes that have occurred of late. Most of the issues presented as controversial or discussed in the book (for that is how I view many of the questions broached in the work) still have not been resolved or settled unequivocally. Let me also say from the outset that I am virtually in total agreement with the author's assessment, i.e., I think like him and the general tenor of the book is close to my own approach.

Alongside my flights of admiration, however, I must add the following criticism: to be honest, one must read the book at least two times. This is not so much because it is difficult to grasp and because the issues are difficult to perceive as it is due to form. If the author is interested in an exchange of views and opinions in such meetings as these, I would suggest the need for his taking a second look at the whole, based on the assumption that this edition is the first necessary stage. The work treats an enormous number of issues. In order to comprehend and organize them, one must first describe them. Perfection of form cannot be expected when something is written in great haste.

Such were the needs of the moment. Now it would be worthwhile to reorganize the issues treated and to eliminate the disorder of the various themes and the overwhelmingly descriptive style.

There is, however, a virtue in this weakness. This first edition certainly can serve as an inspiration for several other books, for other authors. There is a wealth of material here and subjects to inspire the thinking of others. Upon reading the book, I myself made a number of notes for my own use and I plan to return to the work often.

Please forgive me for taking the liberty of assessing the book in this form. Today's meeting is important not only for the author. I also see its value in the fact that we rarely have a chance for discussion among ourselves, among Marxists. We rarely have an opportunity to compare the way we think with the way others think. I am not even speaking about the need to compare what party members that hold different world views think, although this, too, is indispensable. I am convinced of this as I call to mind the second stage of the study organized by the Center for Studying Public Opinion to answer the question, "What sort of socialism?" The study proceeded in two stages. After the first stage, in response to a poll, a 600-page paper was prepared that was sent to all those replying that had submitted their texts. The second stage included a meeting of these same people in which they compared their own thoughts and views with those of others. The Marxists themselves even clashed, but their controversies were smoothed over during the discussion. It was pleasant to see and hear how, for example, all of the social democrats that consciously or unconsciously assumed revisionistic positions by comparison with Marxism polemicized with the members of catholic associations, with each revealing the others' weaknesses as we sat passively and looked on. It is rare to be able to sit and look on as ideological opponents fly at each other's throats, rare to listen to their accusations. There is a need for a maximum of such exchanges of thought, for such discussions and such events, to put it facetiously, for "party salons." It certainly would lead to fewer misunderstandings among us.

The possibilities for intra-Marxist discussions are also few. Unfortunately, our party does not get involved here and does not help to organize such meetings. Sometimes it is evident that others have considerably more freedom of speech. There have been situations in which a certain liberal (I do not wish to use names or newspaper titles, since that is not important) has spoken out in the columns of one of the weeklies and his article made no reverberations, or at best led to two or three replies. No one organizes such rebuttals, neither the editorial staff that has the slogan "Proletariat of all countries unite" printed above the paper's masthead, nor the comrades that are supposed to do such things. There is no reaction, no polemic although sometimes these articles are rank nonsense, rubbish that then becomes repeated by others as well. But let a Marxist or someone that professes to be a Marxist come out with something controversial or let a party member make a controversial statement based on Marxist views and immediately a regular "ideological police force" goes into action and quickly finds someone that will offer his contribution to the author's piece. And how can we enter into a discussion here, even if we would like to, for the issues are inviting, for we are jarred when a potential adversary lies mudsoaked? In such a situation, it is dishonorable to sermonize. It is evident how the offering of resistance closes the discussion.

Another way in which exchanges of thought among Marxists are restricted is through the interference of the editors. I reiterate what I once said on this subject for internal use. I consider interference into the party texts of authors and into party weeklies to be a dangerous sign. I wish I were wrong, but something tells me that the proper cooling of emotions has been followed, with increasing momentum, by the disappearance of reason, of ideological press discussions and, consequently, party thinking. I believe that meddlesome interference, like too fine a sieve, does not sort the wheat from the chaff. What do we fear? Some comrades are afraid of a little pussycat. What do we have to hide? Most cases of interference are neither political observations nor substantive comments--they are just comical! However, human beings are not supposed to be laughed at.

As in the past, the proponents of other ideological orientations are in a better position. It is a situation continues in which authors writing from a Marxist point of view become disheartened and forced to fight their way through with their articles, then what has changed in this regard? Sometimes we work, whether intentionally or unintentionally, to create the mythologies of those weeklies that, when one has edited out some stupidity, assiduously replace this with an ellipsis, making it look as if boundless wisdom and grandeur lie concealed therein. God be with them, but I would let them have it. Things are different where the party weekly is concerned: an article loses some of its meaning when it is edited, and the reader knows nothing about this.

The only doors leading out of the crisis are those inscribed with the subjective importance of the working class, with a wise party capable of intellectual leadership and democratic, effective direction. That is why the party needs those that can think for themselves; this opens up the opportunity for polemics and for intellectual ferment. In such encounters, we become seasoned intellectually and overcome unfounded quarrels. The [text missing] are not declining. Social divisiveness is very complex today. And now, how is the party faring in what is most important for it--the extent to which it is able to represent and keep track of the situation of its own class against the background of the other classes and strata? [text out of order] our people, party members are totally unprepared for the political struggle against the opposition and have no experience in ideological discussions. And our full-time activists are not able to talk to the workers, those workers whose interests they are obliged to represent and wish to represent. We do not have to prove this; others have done it for us.

If we are to be stronger theoretically, and it is with this in mind that I speak, considering this our party duty, then first we must convince ourselves and we must be clear on issues under discussion. However, our manner of thinking about specific problems and our approach to them differ. We wish to unite people at every level, beginning with ourselves, the party. This is not unity for the sake of praise or the judgments of those at Politburo or Central Committee meetings. In Marxist terms, to unite means to reach those situations in which the ideological conquering of the prosocialist opposition takes place in the public intellectual argument, after the model of Lenin. The alternative is Stalin's or Gierek's "unity."

This is not the first time I am saying this, at the same time making reference to Lenin in support of my arguments. It has already been pointed out to me that Lenin lived in altogether different circumstances and times. It is not a question of times or the situation, or even of Lenin himself. It is a question of something that is inviolable: the method! It is true that in the works of the classical writers, one can find a suitable quote for every occasion, but we should take to heart the sense of V. I. Lenin's letter to N. N. Kreshchinski (dated 16 February 1921): "1. I have not seen the article, but relying on Kamenev (that he would not recommend a detrimental article), I vote for publishing it tomorrow. 2. In such a case, the only requirements are that 1) a qualifying statement should be inserted that the author or authors are writing as private journalists and not as official persons; 2) a qualifying statement that the article is controversial."

To return to an earlier topic, of course it is possible to speak at great length on the relationships of party-class, party-apparatus, apparatus-working class, party cadres, party and ideology and party and the opposition. Each of these identifying slogans is a topic for lengthy discussion and not only on this occasion.

Party-class, whom does this mean? Do we have enough data to define this class precisely? At the Center for Studying Public Opinion, we are battling tremendous difficulties here, primarily because there is not enough data defining our society. We wish to study the opinions of society, and not public opinion in general. Opinions always belong to someone; they are always specific. We are interested particularly in workers' opinions. In this sense, CBOS [Center for Studying Public Opinion] is not only a political, governmental institution, but also an ideological one that gives preference to worker interests. The problem is: when we say "worker interests," to whom are we referring? The criteria of the 19th century are not longer suitable. The worker today is someone that earns zlotys by the score. Thus, it is the worker aristocracy, but it is also someone that lives on several thousand with a nonworking wife and several children. He may be an engineer or an unskilled worker, making the question that of his share in the division of labor in the production process. Then there is the peasantry. The peasant may be the owner of a specialized, large-scale production farm, a millionaire dealing in enormous sums or a villager farming 2 hectares of sandy soil, living in a thatched cottage with a bunch of kids with no compensatory allowances. Thus, this society presents an entirely different picture today. I do not mention the lower middle class and the middle class, that in these hard times [text missing] [are not declining]. [text out of order] [Is it possible in] this state of sociological study to do this? I doubt it. Generally, research makes use of such criteria as age, sex and education. What, then, can we find out from such studies? What is their usefulness for the leadership role of the party and socialist state policy? To what extent is such data feasible here? Can it be used for class-related decisionmaking?

Another question: party-apparatus. I myself treated this issue in my article "Zagrozenia i szanse" (Dangers and Opportunities). While it is unpleasant for me to speak of this, it is a concrete element of these general considerations. Please observe: the subject of the article was the dangers and opportunities

for the worker issue, for socialism. Near the end of the article, my discoursing on dangers and opportunities forced me to treat the issue of cadre policy, since this is a key issue today and always. I believe that these are issues of tremendous importance for the party at this time. This is so if it is to be a party of a new type, in the Leninist sense, and thus, on the one hand, a party exercising authority and ruling, that must have highly qualified cadres, specialists and party officials, and on the other hand, a party that is in a position to make use of the wisdom of the masses, since without this it cannot be a Leninist-type party, one that knows how to find a common language with its own class, with the workers.

The latter aspect is now the party's greatest weakness. The slogan "closer to the people" is absolutely timely. The fact is that our cadres are not properly prepared for this and the full-time party apparatus cannot do it, having become accustomed to officiating and not to talking to people. In the article, it took me two sentences to assess the current cadres (that appraised themselves and were tested during the Solidarity period). I still maintain that the cadres are rather weak in this regard. Of course, this is not everyone. If one-third are good, this is of some significance to the ruling party. This is nothing to take offense at; it has been proved and it is evident even now in some plants. Many people, convinced that the attitude to them was that they were like gods, felt offended and threatened. Instead of discussing the dangers of socialism, the people that felt threatened took the offensive. Meanwhile, I had made it clear that it was not a question of a party purge, but of clarity of thought, including such clarity in cadre policy, since the issue was current even before the 13th Plenum, before the passing of the resolution on this issue. Moreover, it is not the issue of the resolution alone, but also of practice. I agree with St[anislaw] Rainko on this score. There was no cadre policy in practice, but a personnel policy, and there is a crucial difference between the two.

The discussion on my study of "Dangers and Opportunities" has died down. There are always some sort of more important practical-political reasons that impose silence to the obvious detriment of theoretical issues. This also was the case here. But the problems stayed, not having been an invention. Both supposedly prosocialist tendencies criticized in the article appear continually, representing a real threat to worker interests, to socialism in Poland. If you analyze thoroughly the RADMOR case, you will find it to be an accurate illustration of what I wrote, just as is life itself. It is clear how the technocrats, on the one hand, and the members of the executive board and directors (in the end penalized for this by the party), on the other, defend a bad case and their own man. Both orientations are socialist in the full sense of the word, but ask workers what they think about this. CBOS specialists asked, and NIK [Supreme Chamber of Control] inspectors confirmed the accusations; other, more serious ones were added on to the governmental wastefulness.

The issue discussed by St[anislaw] Rainko, that of how to conduct the struggle, is tremendously important, in my opinion. Against whom are we to struggle, whom should we support, with whom should we conduct a dialogue? I am very much in agreement with this concept; it approaches my own idea of the struggle

through negation and the struggle through acceptance. We are very rigid, we know how to struggle through negation alone, for that is the easiest way. We ought to take a lesson even from our opponents. Take a look at what the church is doing. The church has changed its tactics. It does not launch any full-scale attacks against communism as it once did, it does not curse it, battling us through acceptance alone. They have adopted the slogans from the workers' banners. Look how radically the church's social doctrine has changed, how its philosophy of labor has changed, how often they refer to Marx. It seems that they are ready to accept Marx in his entirety, with the exception, of course, of the class struggle and the theory of revolution. It is in France that they have gone the farthest. Recently I skimmed a work translated from the French by PAX. On almost every page, at least in the first chapter, there were quotes from Marx in a completely positive context. How do we, on the other hand, treat our opponents? Take a look at what we publish on this subject. They are suits for personal offense, in which everything that comes from someone else is treated as inimical and stupid, unworthy of discussion. It is true that whenever we must battle we must battle, that one does not discuss with the political opponent, albeit the propaganda must lay bare his purposes. In ideological confrontations, we must improve and be present at all times. It is high time that we took a critical view of the party's entire theoretical base. This is an issue for separate discussion.

Speech by Kazimierz Mimiur

The manner in which the party performs its leading and leadership roles is becoming an issue of primary importance in our system. This happens because "the party's leading role--as E. Erasmus states in his book--being both one of the truths of the socialist structure and one of its systemic principles, performs many important functions. The most important of these are its ideological, political and organizational functions. These functions may also manifest themselves as inspirational and mediative. (...) the status of this truth is expressed with special force when the Marxist-Leninist party becomes the ruling party" (p 30).

The practical consequence of this fact cannot be overrated. The history of the PZPR and of the PPR before it supplies us with sufficient proofs of the fact that not only the announced program, but in a no less vital way, the practice of the party's performance of its function as a leading force exerts a tremendous influence on the quality and the rate of socialist change. What's more, if we look at Polish society as the result of the sumtotal of the views of the individual states of consciousness and the externalized political attitudes therein contained, then it is possible, without any greater danger of exposing oneself to the charge of equivocation, to state that the party's program in its historical development met with the approval of society. Frequently, however, in crisis situations, the style in which the party has implemented its most basic function--that of leading the working class in its actions aimed at building socialism in Poland--has led to controversy.

Thus, it is no accident that discussions on the model of the party's operation have resulted in the most basic answer to the question of how the party is to perform its leading role. Which relationships of the party and the class that

it represents and whose aspirations it is supposed to embody are the most beneficial from the viewpoint of effective action and also the preservation of ideological principles? Under Polish historical conditions (with its ties to religion being far closer than those of many European countries, its strong noble tradition, relatively weak proletarian traditions emanating from its economic backwardness, its specific brand of patriotism and the like), how are the communists, organized in the party, to present their developmental vision to society, to convince society of this vision and integrate society around it? Many such questions, that are of greater or lesser importance, but are extremely vital for practical action, may be asked. At the same time, we know how difficult it is to answer them, how much effort is still needed to get the facts and how much we still must do to build real social trust in socialism and our party out of the sum of these efforts. We also know how difficult it is to translate theory into proper practical actions and, at the same time, how easy it is to encumber these actions with either theory or practice.

That is why it is so very important to improve practice and to continue the creative development of theory, keeping in mind that there are no perfect theories. Here let us use an example of metamorphosis from the field of physical chemistry: does the fact that there are no perfect gases, and that Bohr's model of the atom is very far from the real atomic structure, in any way diminish the importance of these theories? Would it be at all possible to resolve many practical questions of technology if science did not make use of such imperfect theories? We must reiterate Lenin's words: "The revolutionary movement is impossible without revolutionary theory."

Thus, practical issues mark out the range of theoretical considerations on the subjects of how the party is to perform its leading role with regard to its class, how it is to lead society in the name of working-class interests, how it is to perform this role in a given state making use of the structure that is appropriate to it, how relations between the party and state organs should shape up and how the party should build its own structure to achieve optimal results in the implementation of ideological assumptions while preserving its communist identity.

The lack of theory, the immature state of research and the limited nature of theoretical study of party structure has always resulted in losses for it. Narrowminded practicality and a nonchalant attitude to research in the formulation of the principles of party action have always resulted in errors that could have been avoided. The party's task is not only to resolve current problems but also to predict the development of events as closely as possible. Clearly, this is an extremely complex task, calling to mind the solution of equations with a large number of unknowns. Obviously, some mistakes cannot be avoided. In any event, however, the most expensive thing in social practice is the trial and error method in a situation where theory enables us to forego expensive trials. Let us then reiterate that the party's structure must come into being as a result of theoretical study supported by reliable research and observation. Voluntarism in deciding upon one practical solution or another is always very costly. Recent years have shown that this expense brings us dangerously close to bankruptcy. Thus, it is worthwhile to conduct theoretical discussions on the structure of the party, i.e., on its optimal performance of its leading and leadership roles in the process of building socialism.

E. Erasmus wrote his book after the experiences of August. The essence of the title argument boils down to the issue of whether we should have democratic centralism or bureaucratic centralism. The author comes out decisively in favor of the Leninist formula of the fundamental principle of the life of the new type of party, i.e., democratic centralism. This may lead, however, to many doubts and misapprehensions emanating from the various ways of understanding such concepts as the party's leading role, democratic centralism, ideological unity, social system and structure, decisionmaking in a body, the openness of life and many others. E. Erasmus tries to give an unequivocal meaning to these concepts. He presents their various interpretations and the development that emanates from the changing situation in which the party has had to conduct its struggle and its work. We also know that these concepts have been used at every stage and that no one has denied either their sense or their significance, except for extreme and overt revisionists. Thus, the subject of the continuing discussion is, in my opinion, not so much the party's leading and leadership roles or the need to deepen democratic centralism in the party as it is the conceptual scope of these terms, their range and their boundaries.

E. Erasmus assumes that the key to solving the basic problems of our society is the party. The kind of party it will be and the way it will work within the entire mosaic of social forces will largely determine our country's reality and its political, economic and ideological face.

Although the party is not the only force in society (e.g., the church is not subject to the direct influence of the party), "...it is the only political force in the socialist system that can and should direct the process of change. It is the most organized political force. It possesses the theory of the building of socialism. Other forces, including the potential adherents of democracy, do not possess these attributes" (p 93). Hence, everything that the party does is of greater significance than similar acts performed by someone outside the party. This imposes a special responsibility on the party and its echelons and organizations, as well as on particular members. "That is why the question with regard to why the PZPR must possess and continually confirm its ability to lead is not rhetorical" (p 93).

This ability to lead determines the party's strength. Practice during the most recent period confirms this especially clearly. The priority issue is the link with the working class, the skill to hear workers out and to set up the party program on this basis. The skill to conduct dialogue with its own class, even under such unfavorable circumstances as existed during the period of the crazy Solidarity demagoguery or after the shock evoked by martial law and the stepping up of the activities of the political underground has enabled the party to preserve its position and to bring about a state of normalcy in Poland without resorting to drastic repressive measures. It must be acknowledged that at that time there was no shortage of "hardliners" that called for settling things quickly with the opposition and all opponents. Today we see that choosing the path of dialogue and not repression was the right thing to do. This is evident in plants and in grassroots party elements. The party's perception of existing conflicts, both those that are the historical legacy of previous systems-type structures and those that are growing up under the new systemic conditions, allows for a realistic assessment of the situation, lends a new

dimension to party-worker ties, enables demagoguery to be opposed and creates premises for rebuilding credibility. In his work, E. Erasmus encourages such party activity.

Step by step the party has been able to regain trust by admitting the mistakes it has made to its own class and by painfully pointing out errors resulting from the placement of tactical actions over principles. "The party is not strong where excess and corruption exist, where the consistent execution of resolutions is replaced by inconsistency, where resoluteness is replaced by the vacillation of leaders, where ideological commitment is replaced by concern over parochialist interests, where fervor is replaced by views that are in conflict with working-class interests, where views of commitment are replaced by bureaucratic views, where politics based on principle is replaced by political intrigue, tolerance of views by opportunism and unity is replaced by the stratification in ideological and political terms of the members of leadership, combined with the existence of cliques and coterie that prop up each other (...) [it is not strong] when the political leadership does not perceive the social sources of successes and of the phenomena of deformation, when it rejects the possibility for the existence and development of negative processes, even such processes as the existence of bureaucratism and technocracy in the work of the state apparatus in socialism and the existence of the antisocialist opposition, when it does not take into account the need to defend the interests of working people before government policy, when it fails to take into account the imperative that in its leadership capacity, the leadership is subject to the party and the party in turn is subject to the working class, when social phenomena are explained only through the aid of the operation of subjective factors and when leaders think that they are always able to act according to the goals they have outlined for themselves and to direct events at will" (pp 97-98).

The open acknowledgement of this list of weaknesses that troubled the party particularly severely during the period between the Seventh Congress and August 1980, strongly emphasized at the Ninth Extraordinary Congress, and the proposals in the resolutions and documents of this congress for ways to surmount these weaknesses have become a basic platform for the party's discussion with the working class. The proposal for extensive reforms both in the political and economic system was a vital element of the Ninth Congress program.

The book "Spor o kształcie partii" includes a discussion of that part of the reforms announced by the Ninth Congress that concern the political system, and particularly the fundamental force of this system, the party. The author analyzes the standards of intraparty life, organizational structures, the electoral system, the principles of operation of the party apparatus and the machinery of decisionmaking in the party. He also discusses the place of the PZPR in the political system of Poland. A number of E. Erasmus's ideas already have been implemented. These include the preparation of service regulations for political employees that, when lacking, was in Erasmus's estimation one of the causes of the alienation of the apparatus; the preparation of a concept of cadre policy that was consistent in its assumptions where the previous inconsistency led to degeneration. PRON (Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth)

has arisen as a movement that provides political parties, Catholic associations and nonparty members with an opportunity to conduct a social dialogue according to partnership principles.

The greatest value of this book, however, especially for practitioners that deal primarily with implementation, and to a lesser extent with the preparation of its program or the research of the operation of the political system, lies in the persistent pointing out of the dangers to the party that lie within the party itself. The practitioner always has a tendency to seek out the simplest and shortest path in the implementation of partial goals. E. Erasmus warns against this danger. The shortest path is not necessarily the best path, and the simplest path may turn out to be very rugged.

Practice often and willingly uses tested methods of operation. The press of events and the multiplicity of issues frequently compel this. This is not due to ill will or for the avoidance of inconvenience, but simply due to the desire to keep an eye on everything, to get a grasp on all current issues. And so, we have an entry in the Constitution on the subject of the party's leading role. Meanwhile, E. Erasmus aptly notes that "The Constitutional entry on the principle of the party's leading role does not guarantee its automatic implementation in practice. We should single out the ideal, the structure of the path to the ideal and, moreover, the difference between the ideal and reality. If reality and new phenomena are not taken into account, even such phenomena as the appearance in Poland of a generation of young, educated, highly qualified workers, the party is doomed to verbalizing the ideal and, as a consequence, to lagging behind the processes of which it was the chief architect (...) not only can it lag behind processes as a result of a preponderance of old methods in leading society, but it can become shocked by the mass unrest of young workers employed in large industrial plants (...), that it itself initiated in order to create a large-scale industry working class. Someone may say that this is a historical paradox. This does not have to be the case. It is so when the party, on the one hand, succumbs to its own successes in creating the socialist society and the nation, or when it tries to use obsolete methods to resolve conflicts, on the other" (p 122). And although we may add as a sidenote that, in the first place, the working class unrest did not shock the entire party, but only its leaders that were warned of the increase in negative phenomena during the discussion that preceded the Eighth Congress; in the second place, that there is no ignoring the work of organized forces of the antisocialist opposition--one cannot deny that the author has gotten to the heart of the matter. We also note another danger pointed out by E. Erasmus: it is easier for us to build something at a tremendous effort and with the commitment of large sums than to maintain all of this by everyday solicitude and work. This refers not only to large plants, although it does concern them above all.

E. Erasmus adds many like dangers: the tendency toward excessive centralization where management ostensibly facilitates but in reality incapacitates the lower elements and blocks the channels of information from the bottom to the top, as well as distorting the information flow from top to bottom; the pragmatic approach to the law results in the ascendancy of parochial interests over the interests of society in general; the vague character of party resolutions

leads to their interpretation at will; ostensible joint action often puts the decisionmaking in the hands of individuals and means that responsibility for decisions does not spread throughout the body and the like.

According to E. Erasmus, all these dangers start from bureaucratic deformation, from the replacement of democratic centralism by bureaucratic centralism. Here also we must say that the author is correct. However, this admission on our part is unnecessary, since social practice, the highest criterion of truth, already has shown that he is right.

Besides indicating which party structure is undesirable, however, does "Spor o kształtu partii" introduce any new proposals? Yes, it does, if only those that were put into practice after the work appeared. This is enough to recognize the value of the work. However, as E. Erasmus points out in the introduction, this does not mean that the book exhausts the issue. The work mainly treats the general principles of party work, and the central authorities are the major area of study. Central level solutions are of tremendous importance since they define the framework of the party's operation. But we know from practice that they do not close the issue. Even in the most highly centralized system, the apex of the pyramid is subject to the influence of the base. Feedback exists between the two. The adoption of the democratic route further strengthens the mutual interaction of the "bottom" and "top." The economic reform demonstrates clearly that the departure from orders-bureaucratic methods in essence increases the importance of centrally made decisions. If, at one time, the detailed decisions of the government or the Sejm, often imprecise or ill-considered in addition, led to consequences after a certain extended period, then at present systems-type decisions evoke reactions almost immediately. The potential for independent decisionmaking within the framework of the system is immeasurably greater, but the effects of these decisions are also much more important. It is impossible at present to speak of party structure without analyzing its operation in provinces, gminas and plants. It is there that the battle over party structure is played out.

The universally approved program of the Ninth Congress, the democratic Statute and the code of electoral regulations will be verified above all in the work of the primary and middle party elements. The instruments of democracy that E. Erasmus prescribes so strongly in "Spor o kształtu partii" and that were brought in by the Ninth Congress and subsequent PZPR KC plenums, like all instruments, have this shortcoming: they enable much work to be done as long as they are used competently. Such is the law of history. I do not wish to be thought of as an enemy of democratization. I only wish to guard against the naive belief that democracy can be valuable in and of itself. The democratization of life will endure if the party masses, firmly rooted in their class, will want to give it a permanent character and will be able to do this. Their knowledge and political culture will decide this. Likewise, the general dissemination of the machinery of democracy in turn lies in the hands of the elective officials of the apparatus and the party theoreticians.

Thus, the discussion on party structure must reach down to its foundations. Scientific studies, reflections and the concepts generated on this basis must

encompass the entire party structure. The party is a living thing that is changing constantly. Thus, the discussion of its structure can never end.

One cannot reproach a writer for failing to wrap up a very complex issue in its entirety in a single book. A good rule for the scholar is to select the subject of research and reflection. It must give him satisfaction when his work evokes among the reader the desire to see the area of issues studied by the author expanded.

The practitioner sees the need for this, just as it is necessary to view the structure of the party not only through the prism of the errors that have been committed and their determinants. It is not a question of passing over something in silence. On the contrary, it is a question of showing the evolution of a complex phenomenon: the operation of the party in the reality it has transformed. It is understood that this evolution has not taken place either smoothly or without conflict. Not only is it true that today's errors were not perceived yesterday--they were not errors yesterday. Today we are aware beyond measure that when methods and mechanisms remain unchanged over an extended period, they begin to hamper progress and become ineffectual in the face of the objectively changing reality.

Thus, let us not treat these mechanisms as fixed and binding once and for all, but let us also be concerned over the compliance of our goals with the expectations and needs of the party and the nation. It is in this field that the especially important and responsible role of party theoreticians, their theoretical ideas and their books are revealed.

Speech by Edward Erasmus

Two currents are clear in the discussion on my book: one that approves of the book and another that criticizes its shortcomings. The former current was presented by Dr St[anislaw] Raitko in his address, and was continued and expanded upon in the discussions of Docent Dr St[anislaw] Kwiatkowski, editor L. Krasucki and others. Prof Dr A. Bodnar expressed the latter current in his speech.

For me, both currents of the discussion are constructive, although I do not believe that it would be possible in a single book to fulfill all of the methodological demands listed by A. Bodnar. The problem was not, and is not, an easy one. When writing a book, we must work our way through many obstacles, and not only those named by A. Bodnar: the adoption of the journalistic-scientific convention, the descriptive-historical convention and the normative convention. The work is directed towards party members taking direct part in the struggle over the Marxist-Leninist nature of the party. In this struggle, many problems and questions suggest themselves. Moreover, reflections on the party are tied in closely with the specific ideological and political situation. Is it possible to divorce oneself from the realities, from the political struggle? I wrote the book "Spor o kształcie partii" at a time when the attack of counterrevolution was in motion against the party, when the attachment to ossified vertical structures was still strong and, moreover, when the so-called lateral structures, various clubs and forums began to emerge.

It was obvious to me that we must defend the party. That is why a goal of the work was, on the one hand, not to hide the sometimes bitter truth about the party and, on the other, to embark upon a polemic with the various non-Marxist currents in the party. I chose the route of open, honest reflection, even though I knew that I would encounter accusations made both from scholarly and political positions. At that time, it was not easy to abide by the strictures proper to theoretical studies. It was not possible to make statements that were verifiable. Likewise, the literature in existence thus far could not serve as a foundation for verifying statements. Hence the open questions in the work. I preferred to make hypotheses than to be tempted to verify each idea. Thus, I cannot agree with the charge that I lacked concern over the empirical verification of statements. Life itself has verified the state of the party to date, and history has verified the pathological occurrences that have arisen, in the form of anarchosyndicalism in the party, for example.

I speak of this in the context of A. Bodnar's statement on the issues of the nation and the party. I consciously bypassed the party-nation and nation-class relationships. These are complex issues, but that is not why I chose not to discuss them. They are problems in and of themselves to be treated in a separate work. Throughout the work, I abided by the principle that if I cannot say anything new on a subject or exhaust it, I merely ought to note it or bypass it. Moreover, the national issue has a rich base in the literature on the subject. In this sense, I agree with the critical remarks of Stanislaw Kwiatkowski that the questions formulated in the book are projected for several monographic works.

I purposely made the description of social reality and the construction of specific statements on this basis the point of departure in the book. It was not my intention to decide the degree of their universality or their generality or to decide which of them are to be obligatory. I left this for future discussion. Finally, I did not characterize the state of knowledge on the subject of the party. In speaking of controversy within the party, one cannot but make reference (or at least attempt to refer) to the theoretical achievements, to make some sort of report on past views on this subject, as A. Bodnar aptly noted. We can speak of deviations emanating from the content of past literature. It is this literature that formed the consciousness of the party aktiv from top to bottom. We can say that this is one of the causes of simplistic treatment or of the use of simplistic Marxism. Besides, all of us, as ideologs and theoreticians, have contributed to this in some way, particularly those that have been involved directly with the theory of party policy, of political systems, of the state and the like. In my estimation, this is an issue we must analyze thoroughly and ever report on to readers.

I likewise add that discussion on the party is not merely semantic discussion, discussion on the logic of language or on the logic of politics. It is also discussion of the research approach to such a delicate and complex substance as is the Marxist-Leninist party exercising its authority and also being bound to steer social changes of a revolutionary nature. It is also discussion of the vision of the PZPR in categories of the past, in the context of successes and crises and in the context of strengthening tendencies that accord with democratic centralism or bureaucratic tendencies in the party and involving social

and political relations with these tendencies. It is the discussion over scholarly and intellectual honesty, over the scope of freedom in expressing thought and in formulating hypotheses and scientific statements derived from the directives of historical materialism. I totally share the view of St. Rainko that we must try to answer not only the question of how the political process has proceeded, but why it has proceeded and proceeds in one way and not another, the question of which social forces hamper the true development of the party and which groups in the party are interested in the development of the intraparty democracy.

As I look today at the contents of the book, I perceive its many gaps and failures. I formulated some theses as the point of departure for further study. I could not find satisfactory answers to some questions. I included them in the book in order to inspire discussion, to stimulate intellectual ferment and also to create a certain precedent in approaching research. The statements of St. Rainko, L. Krasucki and St. Kwiatkowski show that it was impossible to do otherwise in 1981. Many processes were in the course of happening. That is why I agree with the direction of the thinking of St. Rainko when he says that reflections on the party should not begin with wishes but with a description of its state in the historical dimension and in the context of "the entire benefit of its inventory," as L. Krasucki aptly observed, alluding to the ideas of V. I. Lenin.

Both those opening the discussion and the discussants focused their attention on two different levels of the book. St. Rainko, L. Krasucki, St. Kwiatkowski and K. Mniur concentrated on what is contained in the book that is new or interesting. For variety's sake, A. Bodnar analyzed the shortcomings, the unclear statements and the obscurities, and looked for what was lacking in the book that he thought it should contain. I agree that the terms of scientific categories should be used precisely, that the methods of analysis and verification of statements should be used accurately and that oversimplifications should be avoided. It should be added, however, that simplifications, often forced by the state of research, are a form of approaching the truth. I think that it is from this viewpoint that one should look at the terms theory and concept as they occur in my book. Theory is a collection of general statements verified by research or social practice. Concept, on the other hand, is characterized by a high level of hypothesizing in judgments. Generalizations on the development and patterns of the manifestation of researched phenomena are based on postulates that are hypothetical due to the lack of complete information. I am not certain whether the examples listed by A. Bodnar may be considered to be postulates. Nonetheless, postulates have been the point of departure for the making of important political decisions and have not been only the expression of the concepts of theoreticians. They have functioned in practice as principles and political norms; they have impacted on the lives of working people. Hence, research on the party does not confirm the thesis that "every scientific-directive statement can be formulated as a nomological statement." The principle of the primacy of heavy industry over light industry and the thesis on the transition to fully developed socialism did not assume this form. Not only politicians, but also theoreticians in the social sciences have treated these principles as some of the major elements of the theory of the building of socialism. Moreover, the

term "theory" is used with several meanings. A. Bodnar uses it in a sense based on the study of the theory of knowledge as a system of fundamental statements, ordered logically and linked together by means of specific logical relationships. This is the right direction of thinking. If I write a book about current phenomena, however, such strictures sometimes may stand in the way of scientific reflection.

I would like to add that description, too, is a scientific category, provided that it is based on observation, experience or historic materials. In studies conducted to date on the operation of the party and its paths of development, the description of the status quo, of its current situation, has been avoided. Therefore, the purpose of description in my book, where it represents an important element, is to try to recapture phenomena, processes, events and their causes and consequences dynamically and in progress: yesterday, today and tomorrow. For example, unless we look into history, we cannot explain anything properly. This refers to the party as well. Without history, it is easy to forget about the 1956 and 1980 events. Without history, the years 1980 and 1981 are merely an accidental phenomenon, merely a departure from the proper building of socialism.

L. Krasucki has noted an important problem. I am speaking here of his proposal to expand reflection by using a broader material base and by analyzing more extensively the achievements of other communist parties in the area of overcoming the crisis or surmounting the conflicts that occur under the conditions of the development of the socialist structure. Here we have the Soviet, the Bulgarian, the Hungarian and the Czechoslovakian experiences. This allows us to grasp the issue more broadly and also to avoid polonocentric, one-sided thinking. In the past tradition of research on the sphere of issues of interest to us, two approaches alternated: the universalist and the specific. Within the framework of the former, the general was expressed in the main sometimes being limited to a presentation of the assumptions of "doctrine"; within the second approach, attention was focused on numerical data: the number of party members, the social make-up, the participation of party members in the make-up of people's councils, in social organizations and the like. Both approaches are one-sided. L. Krasucki formulates yet another proposal: namely, that we take into account in our research what is universal and what is specific for every party. Under this approach, it is better to be aware of the complex process of the development of our party. This proposal should be treated as a practical guide directed towards people involved in research on the party in socialist countries.

The conception of the question of the working class, particularly in terms of the relationships of class vs. party and party vs. class, is a separate issue. A. Bodnar and J. Kucinski have spoken of this. Their dissatisfaction here is justified. The work does not treat all aspects of this important issue for three basic reasons. I did not intend to exhaust the subject of views on the essence of the working class or to reconstruct arguments on such sociological concepts as the nation, class and working class. Let us be frank--the state of knowledge on the working class in the socialist society, including in Poland, is still unsatisfactory. We are still using the classic, model, bipolar division. We say that in Poland, we have a working class, a peasantry

and an intelligentsia. We also divide society into those that have and those that do not have the means of production, and into those that derive benefits from this for themselves and those that are, in some sense, deprived of them. Karl Marx wrote in "Das Kapital" that he dealt only with the two basic classes, but that this was due to the synthetic nature of his approach. Nonetheless, he does not exclude, but rather, envisages the need for the operation of all classes that really function within the structure of society. We know a great deal about the basic classes, but we also avoid answering the question of whether it is possible to identify nonbasic classes in Poland. Traditionally, we speak of the working class in general terms as a vast, uniform social group. Meanwhile, the working class is differentiated internally, sometimes disintegrated and even divided: there are workers that participate directly in the production process, workers employed in the goods trade and workers that perform leadership functions in the system of management. And there is possibly also a group called workers that rejects the workers' work ethic and wishes to make a lot of money with the least amount of effort. I think that the latter group makes up that part of the working class that may be called the "lumpenproletariat."

Let us also note, if generally, how widely the group of white-collar workers is differentiated. Thus, I believe that, as long as we do not differentiate the classes that differ not only in their relationship to the means of production but also in their place in the social organization of labor and in their participation in using the national wealth, as long as we are not able to point out the criteria for distinguishing the basic and nonbasic classes, it is for that length of time that much vagueness will continue, for example, in defining the class nature of social and economic policy.

The question of objective and subjective working class interest is also related to this. We know that the party has not always been successful in articulating properly the interests of particular occupational groups or the interests of an entire class. In all probability, we will be able to see more clearly the interests of the basic classes in the capitalist system that to identify them during the period of the building of socialism. We will not be able to identify fully the current and long-range interests of the entire working class in conjunction with the interests of the other classes, strata and social groups. I think it is high time that we try to answer the question of which groups and strata of the working class have determined party policy in the final analysis. Is it possible that no group has had a decisive impact and that it is only together that they have consented to certain actions of the authorities and not others? I think that we must agree with such an idea. Only then will we be able to speak more clearly of the issues of articulating the needs and interests of the working class through the Marxist-Leninist party and trade unions. Thus far the party has aptly articulated the interests of the polar classes within the bounds of the period of struggle to gain and retain the authority. I am thinking here mainly of the great social reforms that have been implemented on the party's initiative. On the other hand, it is more difficult to define secondary interests and the interests of the working class during the period of the advanced building of socialism. Thus far, we have not had reliable and tested instruments for identifying class, stratum and group interests, not to mention the interests of particular regions and provinces.

When we speak of the party, we realize that it has a dual nature. As A. Bodnar has noted, it is the organizer of the working class and the force that exercises authority, i.e., the ruling party. It is the working class vanguard; at the same time, we want it to serve its class. While it is responsible for the socialist direction of the country's development, it also must reckon with other sociopolitical forces. This is a dialectical conflict, just as there is a conflict between the principle of equality and the principle of the leading role of the working class and its party. But conflict is not only a theoretical category that expresses and reflects objective phenomena. Conflicts are part of the nature of natural and social existence; we must identify them continually and persistently overcome them. Thus, neither the cheap adulation of the working class as "the salt of the earth" nor the bold incitement of the party to "push forward" under the banner of the vanguard helps, despite the fact that the working class consciousness differs from the party consciousness. The former approach makes the party into a rear guard and the latter fosters the generalized view that the party can do anything it wants to do. It also fosters the view that the party can and should take upon its shoulders the responsibility for meeting all of the needs and interests of the working class. I differentiate class interests and social interests.

I believe that the party is obliged to identify and resolve primarily class and stratum interests. Group, regional and community interests, on the other hand, have a different status. I say this because I wish to allude to the statement of A. Bodnar that suggests that I think that the party should perform the function of articulating interests only in an indirect manner. Perhaps the general nature of this section of text led to such an interpretation. However, the relevant passage was followed by this: "In theory, the direct articulator of working class interests is the Marxist party, and then the state and other social organizations; however, it performs this role indirectly. The articulation of state interests is the final stage." Actually, the last part of the statement is imprecisely formulated. I wanted to note the procedure for articulating interests in the party-social organizations-state relationship. This does not preclude the existence of other relationships, about which I write in another part of my book. The section I have quoted, however, does not indicate that the party itself articulates and implements the interests of working people, including the working class. Other political units such as trade unions, and especially people's councils participate in this process. If socialist social organizations, including people's councils, are functioning properly, the party can permit itself a certain distance with regard to secondary social interests, and particularly with regard to the interests of lower middle class groups. On the other hand, if the party assumes the responsibility for articulating and implementing all interests, then little remains to be done by the other components of the political system: at most, there is their duty to implement or passively attend this process. Even the right to note existing irregularities disappears from the field of vision. This is the situation we had in the 1970's. Meanwhile, the fact of the matter is that the party should set up conditions for increasing its distance in many matters, including social interests. This does not mean that I am an adherent of the party's abandoning its duty to observe everything that is related to social interests and its duty to react when group, regional and ministerial interests, not to mention parochial interests, obscure the general

interests of society. The party's interference in the sphere of these interests, however, need not always be direct, i.e., understood as the duty to take part in executory organs. The executory function belongs to state organs. Meanwhile, the entire time, the party identifies, verifies, programs and obliges state organs to make specific decisions in the interests of the working class and working people.

Let me state another, related problem in the form of a question: is it not a deception to call the working class the ideal class? It is not merely a question of its broad differentiation in terms of age, its role in the social organization of work and the like. We also may speak of certain negative phenomena within the working class itself manifested in passivity and apathy that in no way rule out the role of this class as the ruling class. But are we not also dealing with a process that V. I. Lenin called the ebb of the revolutionary wave? Hence the question of what to do and how to set in motion the impulses for continually moving the working class and for sustaining not the great revolutionary moods, but at least its occupational and political activism. This is the dilemma to be resolved. The party is not prepared fully for this task.

In this way we reach the discussion of ideology. The problem lies in the fact, however, that ideology defining the party's identity may be (and has been) examined in two aspects: the didactic-political (training) and the theoretical. Most often we stress the training aspect, for we rightly believe that it is the party's duty to bring the socialist consciousness to the working class. If it abandons any theoretical ambitions and refrains from creatively generalizing the role of the working class, however, then we doom the training process to being the repetition of generalized formulas. We must reveal the patterns of social development and implement properly the class interests of the fundamental, worker social base of the party. The abandonment of theoretical ambitions dooms the party to narrowminded pragmatism, to the coordination of conflicting interests, to class compromises and to the solution of issues that are the result of social pressure, to the detriment of the modeling of social processes that precedes the immediacy of current experiences.

I move now to the question of equality in the context of the leading role of the communist party. This issue is not resolved in full in Marxist axiology. Thus, my statements on this subject may be treated as thinking along this line and a plane for future discussion. The principles of equality and of the leading role of the working class affect various spheres of political and social life. Equality, if it may be so expressed, is an idea that serves to organize social life according to the new, Marxist hierarchy of values. During the transitional period from capitalism to socialism, however, socio-political relations are organized according to other principles as well, primarily through the ushering in of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is an instrument for implementing the guiding principle of equality. There is a dialectical unity between the assumption of equality and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and a conflict as well. If we abandon one principle or the other, we open the door to abandoning socialist social reforms and Marxism. The dictatorship of the proletariat is related directly to the leading role of the Leninist-type party in society and in relation to other political forces.

This role emanates not from the constitutional statement, but from the fact that the working class and its party play a real role in the process of building socialism. Thus, equality in the relations of political forces is not equilibrium. In the social sciences, equality does not mean identity, understood as the possession of the same characteristics by all units. It is only in the natural sciences that equality is understood in such a one-sided way.

The principles of equality and social justice are the supreme values of Marxism. The principle of the party's leading role is instrumental here. The two have an intertwining relationship, but they are not identical, although we cannot speak of a relationship of mutual exclusion. The principle of equality, in the first place, means that there cannot be more equality in social relations and less equality in political relations. In the second place, together with the principle of the leading role of the working class and its party, it is one of the basic principles of the economic and sociopolitical system. This relates to social and political, cultural and educational relations as well as to legal and even family relations. It is the theoretical premise on which civic rights and duties are based. The fact that the principle of equality is indivisible has important consequences for the organization and operation of political institutions, including the party, the socialist democracy and political life. It marks out a place in the structure of principles for other principles and political standards and gives political units not only a service role with regard to class, but also provides methods for the performance of the vanguard role. Equality obliges political institutions, the party included, to organize political life and interparty relations in such a way as to prevent the rights and duties proclaimed in ideology and in the constitution from departing from the intended direction in the course of implementation. The living content of equality, and of democracy as a result, is expressed more clearly, the more society as a whole and its particular classes and strata make use of the rights to which they are entitled. This enables the improved operation of other systems-type principles, such as the worker-peasant alliance, law and order and the like.

On the one hand, party leadership throughout the political system is indispensable; on the other hand, we must overcome the barriers of inequality, not only between elements of the political system, but also within the party itself. A party without equality can be no more than an efficient instrument of operation. On the other hand, we should be anxious for an increase in the party's strength and the growth of its ideological, political and organizational position together with the simultaneous decrease in differences between classes, and above all differences between people and between the ruling class and its representatives.

I agree with the view of S. Kwiatkowski that party members and party theoreticians as well still have very few possibilities for discussing and publishing works on important scholarly (including ideological) questions. We know of examples of the barriers that exist here from our own experiences. This is not primarily the fault of editorial staffs and editors. The danger has a different aspect: it is the "censorship" of informal groups that do not come out publicly. These are people that formulate an opinion in offices or

informal bodies. Their opinions expressed in this way are primarily negative. This procedure eliminates the question of truth and falsehood, and even of ideological correctness. On the other hand, when problems are viewed through the prism of the administrative perspective and are raised to the level of ideological reflection, then this "method of discussion" leads to the ossification of Marxist thinking and to the dominance of the administrative viewpoint in the party, or to the view that scholarly discussions and their ideas must correspond to the viewpoint of state executive organs. V. I. Lenin warned against this danger at the 10th RCP (b) [Russian Communist Party--Bolsheviks] Congress. We know from experience how difficult it is to exit from the circle of the habits of intellectual and political ease. Another such barrier is the fear (otherwise often understandable) of the return of anarchosyndicalism and the fear of the return of irresponsibility and political demagoguery cultivated under the banner of "the creative development of Marxism," and, at the same time, at the expense of the party's leadership role and at the price of the abandonment of the socialist direction of the country's development. Sometimes, however, this fear degenerates into "wishful thinking," replacing the honest analysis of phenomena and political processes by statements on behalf of systems-type principles and preferring the profession of good intentions to the posing of real problems that are tied in with the social and spiritual situation of the country. It also happens that the claim that a publication is controversial is an encoded signal that it should be passed over in silence, not noticed. The term "controversial" is a negative recommendation. Were such a state to continue, we would exit with difficulty out of the enchanted circle of impotence, prejudice and epithets. There is no creative Marxism without a scholarly polemic among Marxists. Creative Marxism begins where quotes leave off. Creative Marxism is developing, on the other hand, because of the Marxist analysis of reality. The working class, the party, the party apparatus and the like can be this reality.

In this way I would like to make reference to the section of the discussion that treated the party apparatus. There are many myths surrounding the apparatus. In the past and now, some have believed that it is enough to broach a subject in general, and this will hasten and even complete the process of strengthening the party. Such was the case after 1956 and in 1970. Others believe that a changed apparatus guarantees forward movement. I believe that, in addition to changing the personnel structure, we must introduce the proper structures and machinery of the party's operation, including relations within the party apparatus. I formulated the research guideline in my book in the following way: "... the successes and failures of the apparatus should be divided between party legislative and executive elements. The party apparatus is not the legislator, but a part of the party, and the least numerous part. As such, it also has its own virtues and shortcomings." This shows that a defensive attitude toward the apparatus is invalid, as is an attitude that totally discredits the party apparatus. It is wrong, however, to separate the party apparatus from research on the party. True, it is not large in numbers, but it is influential. The force of each movement is not expressed in figures but also in powers, in the level of organization and discretionary powers and in the extent of influence. The apparatus is subject to advisers and experts, it chooses the party aktiv, seeks justifications for its actions in a specific aktiv and exerts influence on the party press and

its theoretical publications. The reverse influence also is felt. The various groups of the aktiv try to mold the apparatus according to the image and likeness of their own interests. Moreover, party media centers may also be included in the party apparatus. Until now, this sphere of party life was out of the bounds of theoretical reflection. I have alluded to this section of the discussion not to polemicize with the criticism of the apparatus, but primarily to note untouched, but important fields of research.

The form of the book and the clarity of its arguments have been criticized. In general, I will say that it was not haste that complicated my writing of the book, but mainly the complex nature of the material as well as the linguistic style of documents. Perhaps, in the book, I disrupted the proportions between the analysis of reality and the description of doctrine. On the other hand, A. Bodnar's view that I should have focused my attention on how things ought to be is too rigid.

In conclusion, I would like to share just one more observation. The statements made by the discussants contained very fruitful proposals. Not only must these be considered in an atmosphere of calm, but also we must find forms and methods for including them in the research process. Some questions require group study, and above all, research of a monographic nature.

I am grateful for the favorable attitude to the book, for the thorough readings of the text and for the extraction of the major virtues and shortcomings. This is helpful for me. The most important thing is that the book has become a point of departure for methodological and substantive discussion. Obviously, the work under discussion does not open up completely new research horizons. It brings to mind once again the guidelines of Marxist research. That is why I treat it as one of the possible attempts to reconstruct the organizational patterns of the party in the process of the building of socialism and as one of the possible attempts to formulate self-knowledge about the party.

8536
CSO: 2600/1134

AIR FORCE COMMANDER HELPS CELEBRATE JOURNAL'S ANNIVERSARY

Warsaw SKRZYDŁA POLSKA in Polish No 24, 10 Jun 84 p 2

[Text] On 23 May 1984 we entertained at our editorial office the Air Force commander, Gen Div Tytus Krawczyc. Despite his power-ending official business, Gen Krawczyc has found time to meet our editorial team, and during our conversation he stressed that he has been a reader of our journal for over 35 years.

For me has been on active service in the Air Force for many years. It was on 9 October 1948 that he entered the Deblin Air Force School, where in the course of his second year of training (which was to last 3 years) the school command decided to use him as instructor, thus advancing his officer's promotion by a year (1950). Next, for almost 19 years he worked as an instructor in the OSL [Air Force Officers School] and after that in the WOSL [Higher Air Force Officers School]. He has flown all the contemporary types of aircraft, among others the piston-engine planes UT-2, PO-2, YAK-11, YAK-18, JUNAK-3 and TS-8 BIES, and from 1956 on he has flown jet-propelled aircraft, beginning with the MIG-15. He is an actively flying jet-aircraft pilot. He has to his account about 4,000 flying hours. In 1971 he was in the USSR, attending a course in the Air Force Academy in Monino, and in 1973-1975 he studied in the K. Voroshilov General Staff Academy of the USSR Armed Forces. We may add that during this 1972-1976 term he was also a deputy to the PRL Sejm. So much, briefly, for the Air Force commander's biography.

While being entertained at our editorial office General Krawczyc spoke in the first place of the problems of the Polish Air Force, close to all of us. In this connection he pointed to certain tasks that should become a matter of topical interest to our editorial team. One of them, of importance, is the popularization of the splendid vocation of being a pilot; this should be presented widely to the youth, putting before them in varied journalistic form the personality models of military and civilian pilots, as well as of flying sportsmen.

In this frank and friendly conversation, in which the general assumed a sympathetic attitude toward our worries and difficulties in editing

and publishing our journal, we also referred to a tradition of our editors in People's Poland. It was precisely by order of the Air Force commander of the Polish Army, dated 31 March 1945, that our journal was brought into existence, and in May, 39 years ago, the first issue of the new SKRZYDŁA POLSKA, reactivated after the war, was prepared to be printed and distributed. Thus it has been, the more desirable to be visited on this very anniversary by the commander of the Air Force, Gen Div Tytus Krawczyk, for which we thank you cordially, Citizen General.

1015

CSO: 2600/1115

OFFICIAL PRESS AGENCY CHARACTERIZED

Warsaw RZECZPOSPOLITA in Polish 20 Jul 84 pp 3, 5

/Interview with editor Janusz Roszkowski, head of the POLISH PRESS AGENCY, by Jan Likowski/

/Text/ The POLISH PRESS AGENCY /PAP/, which appears so frequently in the columns of our newspapers, is celebrating its 40th anniversary. By transmitting nearly 1 million words daily and receiving even more, it assures comprehensive information about world events. On the occasion of this anniversary we turned to the head of PAP, editor Janusz Roszkowski, with a request for an interview, the text of which we publish below.

/Question/ No organized, modern society can do without a press agency which is capable of disseminating news nationally and abroad. Perhaps this is why PAP, although at first under a somewhat different name, is practically the same age as People's Poland.

/Answer/ Of course. The idea itself of appointing a press agency arose as early as in the Union of Polish Patriots in Moscow. The moment the first Polish territories were liberated the Polish Press Agency, POLPRESS, began its operation. This was to be a new type of agency adapted to the needs of the people's state system and to the times. Thus, PAP truly became a contemporary of People's Poland, accompanying it as a chronicler, commentator and publicist. As for the name--the word "POLPRESS" was abandoned along the way as too complicated. This change was made by your paper's current correspondent, editor Marian Podkowinski, who began to abandon the overly-complicated and lengthy name during the first half of 1945 while working as an on-duty editor /dyżurny redaktor/ of the agency. Later the name change was legally approved by law. All the agencies in the world try to use abbreviations which can be easily remembered both aurally and visually. We have accomplished this as well.

/Question/ That is history. What can you tell us about the official character of the press agency, and to what extent is it an element of the makeup of the modern state?

/Answer/ Today, no state can exist without the efficient functioning of news circulation. Actually, this is a truism because good sources of information have been sought not only by present-day states but also by states in the distant past but, of course, they lacked the current high degree of efficiency. However, there was always a need for news. Today, when the world has become, so to say, smaller as a result of new communications possibilities, the significance of the entire problem and of news circulation has risen immeasurably. Every person wants to know not only what is happening in his own country but in the world in general. He is interested in social, economic, political, military, cultural events and problems as well as in technology, science, catastrophes and, finally, sports. We are interested in everything that characterizes a rapidly changing image of the world. However, there are social groups which must be informed more thoroughly and extensively. This concerns opinion-making, scientific, technical and economic spheres and, above all, people who are a part of the apparatus in authority. Every agency, including PAP, prepares news and information for people whose function it is to make decisions. This takes the form of special reports which contain considerably more information and article reprints than can be handled by newspapers and radio and television newscasts. Thus, we create for these groups of people an instrument for becoming aware of what is happening in the world. In any case, the POLISH PRESS AGENCY is the fastest transmitter of news in Poland and the center in Warsaw and in Poland which knows the earliest what has occurred even in the most distant countries.

/Question/ Therefore, PAP is firmly embedded in the world circulation of news. I would like to ask about the methods used in gathering and transmitting news information.

/Answer/ We work in cooperation with a large number of press agencies. Sometimes they are considerably smaller than PAP. However, we also work with the largest agencies which control the world news market. Among the giants, TASS should be mentioned above all. It has more than 100 permanent correspondents in the world and an excellent, comprehensive news service. Then there is the AFP, American UPI and AP and the huge REUTER agency, which is British in origin but currently more international. From these we can obtain information on where armed conflict has erupted, where a coup has taken place, who of note has died, and the political or social event where a tragedy or catastrophe has occurred. On our part, we transmit our own news about Poland to 46 recipients in 4 languages: Russian, English, French and Spanish. We transmit our news by way of cable as well as by radio and that is why, as it would seem, there are more recipients than I have mentioned. Several worldwide agencies transmit news nonstop 24 hours a day. In our building, news information is picked up by several hundred teletypes. This constitutes hundreds of meters of teletype taper per 24-hour period. It has to be selected, translated, edited and arranged according to interests. Despite a great deal of cutting and condensing, we provide our newspapers with such extensive information that it would be possible to fill up even four times as much space as they can reserve for this purpose. The speed with which news reaches us is remarkable. Literally, in a matter of several minutes following an incident of great importance, such as a large catastrophe, a coup d'etat, the outbreak of war or the death of an important person, we already have the information in Warsaw. Radio and satellite communications make this achievement possible.

Question I would, therefore, like to ask you about the place of the POLISH PRESS AGENCY on this world news market. How should PAP's world "ranking" be described?

Answer I would describe our agency as medium-size but in the group of "larger medium-size" agencies. This also reflects the degree of interest abroad in Polish matters and how important they are for the rest of the world. We are a typically national agency which operates, above all, in the area of its own state. We cannot compare to worldwide agencies which have branches in many countries and which transmit their information directly to the newspapers in those countries while working there are national agencies.

Question This is also a problem of Third World countries, which feel dominated by the flood of news information flowing through the channels of large capitalist press agencies. How do you see this problem?

Answer This problem concerns many countries and many commonwealths which would like to become independent of the news domination of large press agencies operating on the basis of commercial principles. Several national agencies have united their efforts but this does not bring any effective results. An efficiently functioning agency of worldwide scope must have at its disposal tested methods of gathering news, work organization, an appropriate cadre base and sufficient funds for utilizing the newest technical devices. This costs money. Meanwhile, it is generally the poorer countries that want to liberate themselves from this domination. However, let us remember that TASS is also among the largest agencies with operations in all countries of the world. It assists weaker national press agencies with its news services. In this way, it enables some sort of balance to maintain itself in the circulation of news.

Question I would now like to return once again to the history of PAP. What were the beginnings of the agency's activity like in Lublin in 1944?

Answer Those were difficult days. The agency actually arose from nothing. There were very few if any people in the agency and no equipment or material whatsoever and practically no technical means. It was necessary to improvise during that hot summer in 1944. The handful of people included, among others: Michal Hofman, who later became PAP's editor in chief; editor Swierczewski, who was PAP's first director; editor Stefan Ziennicki, who works to this day in Lublin; Lukwic Dmochowski and Bernard Wygodzki who were in charge of the technical minimum. For all practical purposes, we had one old radio receiver which we used for foreign language radio monitoring and which took the place of the flow of press agency news. In addition to this, we had two rooms and a worn-out motorcycle which was used for "communication" purposes, as a means of transportation, and for the distribution of bulletins. Such were our meager beginnings. However, some experience did exist in this field because the POLISH TELEGRAPH AGENCY (PAT) was active before the war from 1918. It was also active alongside the government in exile in London. Many former PAT employees went to work for PAP, for example, editor Jerzy Szwajcer, in charge of cultural matters, and the outstanding specialist on international matters, editor Zygmunt Bogucki. I am only mentioning those who are the best known. There were also many others who assisted younger colleagues just beginning PAP work with their professional experience.

Question/ This cannot be compared to the present day. How many bulletins of greater importance does PAP issue currently?

Answer/ Besides the basic bulletin for the press, radio and television, PAP issues approximately 300 reports daily by means of teletype of which, according to our analyses, 50 to 60 are placed in RZECZPOSPOLITA. This includes brief information, reports, commentaries and foreign correspondence from all fields. Altogether, however, we publish 30 bulletins. For 40 years now, we have also been publishing a Special Bulletin with an outlay of approximately 2,000 copies for people who must know more than any newspaper can provide. This constitutes more or less 100 type-written pages daily. The remaining bulletins have a single thematic character, for example, economics, science and technology, culture at home and abroad, world agriculture, a military bulletin, sports abroad as well as a bulletin entitled "FRG and West Berlin," and many others, all the way to a depiction of foreign caricatures.

Question/ As a steady client of your agency, I am familiar with most of these bulletins.

Answer/ And that is not all of it. We also transmit bulletins by radio with the most important news to sailors and fishermen who are out at sea. Our GŁOS MARYNARZA I RYBAKA reaches them daily.

Question/ We hold the work of our colleagues at PAP in high esteem. They have an exceptionally difficult news service to perform. How many news reporters are there on your staff?

Answer/ Altogether, PAP employs 260 reporters, of which 26 are stationed in 25 areas of the world. Our people seldom leave the sphere of anonymity. In principle, this only happens when they present their individual opinions, commentaries, signed editorials, etc. Obviously, we also have branches in all provinces. On the occasion of an anniversary, it is customary to talk about the most outstanding. However, it would be best to talk about our anonymous collective, about the people who through their efforts, frequent emotional tension and great zeal can carry out a basic assignment despite the pressure of time under which they must work. Furthermore, we should also mention several hundred people who provide technical services and who are equally hardworking. However, as far as those who have played a prominent role in the work of the agency during these 40 years are concerned, I would mention from among the heads: editor Michał Hofman; editor Julia Minc, who for 18 years until 1954 was the editor in chief and head for many years of the editorial staff for foreign matters; editor Paweł Kwieciński; the head of the national editorial staff and later director; editor Stanisław Bąkowski; editors: Zbigniew Soluba, Stanisław Lewandowski, Ryszard Frelik, and Andrzej Wybowski; engineer Stanisław Kawa, and many others. It is a question primarily of those whose organizational skills, initiative and political observational insight have had an influence on the agency's work style. It is they who have shaped the anonymous achievements of PAP.

Interviewer/ I wish to thank you for the interview. At the same time, on behalf of the staff at RZECZPOSPOLITA, I would like to convey through you sincere wishes to our colleagues at PAP for continued success in their work.

CROATIA DISCUSSES, PREPARES FOR CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

Zabreb DAKS in Serbo-Croatian 24 Jul 84 pp 22-24

[Article by Zeljko Krusek: "Changes Dictated By Practice"]

[Text] The Socialist Republic of Croatia [SRC] has just begun discussions on possible constitutional changes. It is no secret that things like the authority of all three assembly chambers, delegate elections, the length of the term, communities of opatinas, and the association of resources for projects of general public interest, have been especially subject to criticism.

It is generally known that many discussions and analyses of the functioning of the entire political system, which will soon answer the question of what needs changing and improving, are taking place at the federal and the republic levels. Judging by the early proceedings of various bodies, councils, and offices which are not yet in agreement at the republic level, it is apparent that Croatia is in the early stages of preparation for possible constitutional changes. One might even make the claim that in a way Croatia lags behind other republics which have made certain "adjustments" to their constitutions in recent years.

Ivo Latin, president of the SRC Assembly, recently gave his view of the problems present in the functioning of the political system:

"I think it would be politically immature of us if we were not to see and take into consideration the demands which everyday life makes upon our system. We have to consider seriously what we must change, adjust, and correct--by providing specific details and solutions--in the course which we have in general laid out by the constitution, and consider what has been achieved from all of our party programs and resolutions. We hope that in this way we will provide the opportunity for the further development of our delegate system."

In Latin's opinion, it is virtually the last chance to start to discuss these problems seriously in order to get an inventory of problems by the end of the year which can be "given careful scrutiny from all possible angles." The importance of this announced "urgency" is that we will be able to come up with the appropriate solutions during the latest delegate

elections, the fourth in rotation. Latin points out that delegates would thus be able to begin their term with a somewhat freer hand to devote themselves to their real problems instead of becoming self-involved by returning to current problems.

Five Groups of Problems

Proving that indeed Croatia does not intend to be content only with words, a hearing was brought to order at a joint meeting of the president and the secretary of the Council of Peoples of all our republics and provinces, headed by Pudi Jelic, president of this council of the SPC Assembly. He expressed the hope that from a mutual exchange of experience "Croatia would indeed have the greatest benefit," since it would try to avoid the mistakes of others in making possible changes. However, the painstaking and delicate extent of this whole process, with a multitudinous of specific areas of concern in various environments, is indicated by the astonishment of most of the republic and provincial officials present that there exists such an "unbelievable diversity of practical solutions" in similarly delineated goals for the more efficient functioning of the political system. Prevailing over this situation will not at all be a simple task because in some of the goals all personal solutions seem to come out as "best serving as example to the others." However, the conviction is becoming widespread that the majority of republics and provinces "know what they don't want," but at the same time are rather uncertain as to what changes the delegate system can qualify for in order to carry out the extraordinarily responsible tasks dictated by the constitution and other documents. Thus, as Ivo Latin graphically warns, we must overcome with all our efforts a situation in which it seems that "the whole system is tired out and has reached a point in which it needs some sort of rest."

Discussions about possible constitutional changes in Croatia were actually begun much earlier, but the introduction of specific changes was not undertaken in haste, certainly with justification. Thus, one can only speak conditionally about the aforementioned "law" behind other areas. The general impression is that the discussion has been set in motion over a rather wide front, and in some areas, assembly commissions, the appropriate sections of the Socialist Alliance, republic offices, as well as the Presidency of the SPC itself have become especially involved. At the end of last year, the Assembly's Commission for Constitutional Questions made up "a survey of questions which might be taken into consideration when making possible changes in the SPC Constitution." Ivo Gracic, the president of this commission, was very cautious in his statements because he thinks that only all-inclusive discussions in social-political organizations and communities can indicate more precisely what to change over time by the various decisions. However, above all in view of necessary political deliberateness, and also considering on the other hand Pudijs Jelic's presentation at the Lahren meeting of officials of the Council of Peoples, one need not conceal the fact that we are concerned with five groups of problems for the most part. Thus, we will discuss them one at a time, with the necessary remark that present analyses, research, and experience indicate that there is no need to change basic constitutional determinations, and it is a good

idea to limit possible changes solely with regard to adding those decisions which retard or impede the application of these constitutional principles.

The first group of questions involves the more or less controversial sphere of activities of all three assembly councils, although the Social-Political Council is most emphasized in this regard. Assembly officials think that the present regulations regarding the independent and equal sphere of activity of the councils represent "the weakest, and to a greater extent, an imprecise part of the republic constitution." Rudi Jelir points out that for this reason, none of the councils has been able to construct "its own physiognomy" on a practical level between 1974 and the present. The sphere of activity of the Social-Political Council has unnecessarily been "set too broadly," which keeps it from being involved with basic questions of development and defense of the social system of socialist self-management when functioning on a practical level. The possible unburdening of this council would deal with those questions in which this task has not been primarily established. For sake of comparison, changes in constitutional decisions with regard to narrowing the authority of this council have already been carried out in Montenegro, Serbia, and Vojvodina, while it does not have independent authority in passing laws and other regulations in Macedonia and Slovenia. The basis for these changes is found in the 6 year-old positions of the SANPP Federal Conference, and in Kardelj's "Pravca Razvoja" [Directions of Development]. The goal of possible changes is for the Social-Political Council to lose the epithet of "common jurisdiction council," which is sometimes even called "state jurisdiction council." To what extent it is clearly present in assembly discussions today is best indicated by the fact that the editorship of the HOMELAND (!) office also enters into its working sphere of activity.

Controversial Article

It is the completely opposite problem with the Council of Associated Labor [CAL] of the Assembly. The problem does not so much involve constitutional regulations as in current practice and the methods of work. Thus, in the decisionmaking process involving distribution of income for general and joint needs, CAL does not implement its dominant position as it should pursuant to article 354 of the republic constitution. Article 362 of the constitution, which says that all three councils decide equally on the system of financing social-political communities, the republic budget, and a number of similar strategic documents, causes general confusion. And without making decisions on income distribution, CAL cannot express the class interests of associated labor at either the opstina or the republic level--in other words, all forms of worker alienation from the conditions, resources, and results of his work prevail.

The problems involved in the work of the Council of Opstinas of the Assembly [COA] are no less interesting. While in practice CAL cannot carry out its dominant role in the delegate system, and the Social-Political Council often forgets the essence of its existence because its jurisdiction has been set too broadly, COA simply cries out for more important tasks. Its role is, to put it mildly, too narrowly and imprecisely stated. Practice indicates

that this council is completely independent only in passing laws which establish the founding, joining, and changing of opstina areas (which has not been done since 1978) and communities of opstinas, which establish the operating procedure of the council, and it also independently carries out the election of its officials. Regarding the independence in making decisions about development policy, collaboration between opstinas, and other questions of interest for working people and citizens in local communities, opstinas, and communities of opstinas, it is really a matter of an illusion of independence because hardly any question of this nature exists about which the entire Assembly would not discuss and make decisions. The narrow sphere of activity is especially relevant regarding the COA's lack of constitutional power to be included in problems in the area of public activities. Thus, for example, the council is not authorized to pass laws on basic education, although this is a problem which is of vital interest indeed to working people and opstina citizens. For this reason it is not surprising that the COA is the most frequent user of the institution of the "interested council," pursuant to article 365 of the SRC Constitution. This concerns the council implementing its definite interest in participating in the consideration of certain problems from the sphere of activity of another council using the legal privilege cited.

The second group of problems involves the electoral system. The Commission for Constitutional Questions of the Assembly remarks that most of the criticism of the electoral system proceeds from the viewpoint that it essentially lags behind the possibilities offered by our social-political system, that it has not been adequately adapted to the delegate system, that it is complex, expensive, irrational, and even "not democratic enough." Decisions involving the election of delegates to the Assembly's Council of Associated Labor especially bear the brunt of criticism. According to article 353 of the SRC Constitution, delegates in this council are chosen by delegations of working people at all levels and in all areas of organization, regardless of ownership of production resources. Proposals exist to change this article and to choose delegates for this council of the Assembly from the composition of the Council of Associated Labor of the Assembly of Opstinas. Another question is whether the delegates so chosen represent their work organization, their branch grouping, or even the opstina which chose them. Criticism has also been directed at the way the electoral units for this council are constituted because they are often organized inadequately and on too large of a scale. Thus, basic self-management organizations and communities sometimes have nothing in common except for delegates. So even at the very start communication between the delegates and the electoral base is lost.

Making The Agreement Process Easier

Also controversial is article 209 of the SRC Constitution, according to which delegates of the social-political council of an opstina are chosen so that working people and citizens come out directly for a unified (closed) list of candidates. This almost makes additional elections impossible, since it is necessary to set the entire electoral body in motion for the election of one candidate. The same problem exists with the introduction

of the institution of the variable delegate. One can find many other examples of this type, say, regarding the establishment of the delegate base of delegates for the Federal Council of the SFRY Assembly. In short, because of too much emphasis on the significance of procedure and the large number of operations and proceedings, the actual influence exerted by working people and citizens on the electoral process is minimized.

The third group of questions for possible changes involves the mandate of officials of the assembly and the council of social-political communities. The principle of a 1-year mandate, which resulted from amendments to the SFRY Constitution in 1981--added to make possible a more consistent implementation of the principles of collective work, decisionmaking, and responsibility--has proved to be rather inappropriate in some cases. This is mostly the case with regard to the president of the assembly of social-political communities. Since there is no collective, guiding body there as, for example, in the leaderships of social-political organizations (and it is possible to change the presidents of these bodies more frequently), in practice this can favor the independence of the executive and administrative bodies from assembly influence and supervision. Characteristically, during the Zagreb hearing involving officials of the Council of Opetinas of Republics and Provinces, the Slovenian decision "2 + 2," which has provided favorable results in that republic, was mentioned several times.

The fourth problem, which is connected exclusively to Croatia, involves the status of communities of opetinas as an obligatory, but an expensive and clumsy, form of connecting opetinas. Instead of bearing the burden of the self-management agreement process, and agreement among associated opetinas, these communities have been turned into "classic" social-political communities, or branches of republics (in a subsequent issue, DAKAS will go into more detail on their status "between a hammer and an anvil," and the directions possible constitutional changes might take).

For now, the fifth and final group of changes designated for constitutional amendment is connected with article 62 of the SRC Constitution. This establishes that association of part of the resources of social reproduction set aside for the sake of helping in the furthering of the development of economically undeveloped regions, in the construction and reconstruction of communication, energy, and other infrastructure projects which are of interest to general economic and social development, can be performed on the condition that first of all proceedings of the self-management agreement process regarding the association of resources are carried out. The problem lies in the fact that this agreement process includes over 11,000 subjects, and the proceedings are very complex and expensive. Only when we attempt to accomplish what has been delineated in the constitution is the opportunity provided to guarantee the association of resources by law. In practice, it really turns out that every year the Council of Associated Labor of the Assembly passes a law which obligates association of the resources of those participants which have not accepted self-management agreements. As the aforementioned 11,000 expensive and futile meetings in principle are always accompanied by this type of law for urgent action, the agreement process

assumes the character of a "self-management farce." The solution lies only in an essential simplification of the agreement process.

All of this is only an indication of the many future discussions at all levels of organization and only during the coming months will we be able to see whether possible constitutional changes go in one or another direction. Perceiving problems on the part of opština assemblies, communities of opštinas, and the Assembly is only the first step. That is why Ivo Latin was especially emphatic in saying that "we will not achieve nearly the results we want if the Socialist Alliance is not included in the process in the most direct manner as coordinator, as well as the syndicate in work organizations, to say nothing of the LCV, which must help and keep vigil over this process."

9548
CSO: 2800/413

SERBIA'S YOUTH PAPER MOCKS CRITIC OF POLITICAL APHORISMS

Belgrade OMLADINSKE in Serbo-Croatian 24 Jun 84 p 3

(Commentary by Mirko Mlakar: "Satire--Enemy of the People?")

[Excerpt] If by some chance a hater of wit expressed in its most concise form--aphorisms--had found himself in the crowded small auditorium of the Kolarac People's University 31 May, he would surely have been rolling his eyes, wiping the foam of rage from his lips with shaking hands, and running to the first telephone to report those satirists and their enthusiastic audience to the SDB (State Security Service). There were so many "antisocialist" and "antistabilization" theses at the surprisingly public gathering that every honest taxpayer would have gathered the impression that "hostile slogans" were being chanted not by 14 but by at least double that number of "subverters of the social and governmental order"!

What can a serious citizen think when he hears Radivoje Bojicic saying, "Our aim is man. Aim! Fire!" Does Bojicic not know that ideological purists realize that he is trying to say that human freedoms are being destroyed in Yugoslavia and that military policemen are arresting innocent artists and torturing them by tickling the soles of their feet? Or: what is Milovan Vrzina trying to say with this? "Our Caesar would have a Brutus in each republic and autonomous province." Is he not questioning the constitutional status of the federal units? That evening, several hundred maxims were stated that the "McCarthyites" would calmly class as counterrevolutionary slogans!

Who needs books such as "Write the Same Way You Shut Up"? In the very title of this flowerpot of malice [reference to Zagreb conference document condemning numerous writers and intellectuals, nicknamed "Flowers of Evil" after Baudelaire], Brana Crncevic unmasks himself as an impudent revisionist that even rewards the famous sentence coined by the great reformer Vuk Karadzic ("write the same way you talk"). In any case, research arranged by the commission for agitation and propaganda confirms wholeheartedly the thesis according to which silence fell upon the League of Communists and delegate bodies right after the publication of this book with its destructive title.

However, since we have never been formalists, let us peer into the contents of this basket of insanely poisonous fungi. One analyst has said that he knows very well what Crncevic is trying to say with this aphorism: "A capable person

goes off to join the chetniks and returns from the partisans." In the Analyst's opinion, Crncevic is not only trying to stir up dissension in SUBNOR [veterans' organization] but is also "forgetting" that we are a multiethnic country. Where are the [Croatian] Ustase, [Slovenian] Whiteguardists, [Albanian] Ballists, and the others? In another maxim, the Analyst continues, Brana uncovers his clericalism: "Why only the church? The devil should have been separated from the state, too." When you read this nonsense, what can you think but that the author is advocating reversing the course of history, i.e., remarrying church and state? Anyway, who is the devil that is linked with the larger sociopolitical community? Perhaps the fraternal International Monetary Fund, eh? Perhaps Marx? Or self-management? Only political illiterates fail to comprehend what Crncevic is trying to blacken.

Unfortunately, many such books are sprouting up, pretending to be anthologies of sayings but really being hotbeds of obscurantism and pessimism. The works, not to say misdeeds, of Vlada Bulatovic-Vib, Pavle Kovacevic, Dusko Radovic, Zarko Petan, Milenko Pajovic, and other authors of aphorisms contain not a word of enthusiasm for what has been achieved, not a word of praise or support. Their ideas stink of criticism of everything critical!

However, the counterproductive noisemakers deceive themselves if they think that no force exists to put an end to their filthy rabblerousing efforts. The anticomunism in them did not escape the ever-alert right eye of the ideological hawklet Stipe Oreskovic, chairman of the republic-level committee of the Federation of Socialist Youth in Croatia. In an article entitled "Who Decides and Not Who Tells Stories" (VJESNIK's supplement SEDAM DANA of 10 March), Oreskovic cannot "pass over or ignore certain fundamental trends that might--under certain conditions--grow into cohesive ideologies or even political movements." He degrades his sermon concerning genuine dangers (e.g., "worry" over the "imperilment" of the nation) with these unserious words: "There are anticomunists, too. For example, they pen such aphorisms as these in youth papers: 'One party is sufficient to display an abundant repertoire of encapsulation,' or 'Under communism, boots will not be sold--they will be free,' or 'Some peoples play a poor game of poker, they throw out a king and get back a gendarme [word play in original: zandar = queen in cards], or 'For those who have trouble finding their bearings in books, we have introduced booklets [party membership certificates].'" Of course, there is a lot more, but to list them further would be in poor taste. Even this is sufficient for a superficial illustration of a much deeper anticomunist process, which does not exist solely among young people."

The four-member gang of "anticommunists" has finally been exposed. The virtuous youth activists and fighting party man has called a spade a spade and has frankly, to their faces, almost in a communist manner, called staffers for OMLADINSKE, STUDENT, and MLADOST--Aleksandar Baljak, Vladimir Jovicevic Jov, Petar Lazic, and the deceased Zoran Spasojevic--anticommunists! Eternal gratitude to Comrade Stipica! Fans of aphorisms had thought that these were the four aces of recent Yugoslav satire, but now they recognize their profound error.

Some persons are worried about the future turnings of the ideological and political career of the Anti-anticommunist, who has displayed a high degree of inconsistency. However, those persons who are astonished that three and a half months have passed since Stipe's tale without his having decided to initiate the question of the political and criminal liability of the horsemen of the apocalypse--they are forgetting that the crime of anticomunist activity is never subject to any statute of limitations. Just like war crimes.

CSO: 2800/457

PRVOSLAV BALIC DISCUSSES YOUTH PROBLEMS

Belgrade *SOCIJALIZAM* in Serbo-Croatian No 5, May 84 pp 703-718

[Article by Prvoslav Balic: "The League of Communists and the 'Youth Question' Today"]

[Text] "Only the man who assumes responsibility for his own freedom can be free. And only the man who is in a position to decide democratically can assume this responsibility. I think that it is precisely this awareness that should be the starting point for the policy of self-managing socialist society with respect to younger generations." (Edvard Kardelj, "Pravci Razvoja Politickog Sistema Socijalistickog Samoupravljanja" [Directions for the development of the Political System of Socialist Self-Management].

The ideological fear of youth as an alternative factor in social changes is unjustified, and it is characteristic of exhausted vanguards. The political alternative presented by youth only appears on the social scene when the LC, through the manner and content of its work, rules out the possibility of youth's comprehensive social affirmation in all areas of life, in their earliest years--as stated in the LCY Program.

Lenin also warned about this need to view youth as a relatively autonomous factor in his article "The Youth International": "It often happens that representatives of the older generations do not know how to approach youth properly, and youth is forced to approach socialism differently, not in the same way, not in the same form, and not under the same circumstances as their parents. For this reason, among others, we must absolutely be in favor of the organizational autonomy of the youth alliance, not just because opportunists are afraid of this autonomy, but also because of the very essence of the matter, since without complete autonomy, youth will neither be able to make itself into good communists, nor to prepare itself to bring socialism forward."

Of particular significance to us is Tito's warning, which he gave as early as 1935, speaking about the causes encouraging vanguardism among young people. On that occasion he said, "With its slight or almost nonexistent concern for

youth, along with various other mistakes, the party organization has increasingly lost its standing in the eyes of youth. We are not thinking of using this to justify the various mistakes made by youth, and its erroneous ideas about the role that it plays in the workers' movement; instead, we are warning you about your omissions and mistakes, so that you can avoid them in the future. Undoubtedly young people have gone too far in many things, and these excesses have already been pointed out to them in letters and the role of youth in the workers' movement has been explained to them. It has been told that it is not youth but rather the party that is the vanguard of the proletariat. But it is difficult for youth to understand this, if the party organizations do not demonstrate through their work that they are truly the vanguard of the proletariat."

Social and historical circumstances today have changed in many respects since the time when these positions were expressed. But what practice has confirmed as true has remained for our commitments today, and that is the fact that the older generations cannot ask youth to become fully integrated into society as they have created it, that it is necessary to be sensitive to the time in which young people are living, to their new needs, and their new spiritual and cultural stimuli. Specifically, we cannot lose sight of the fact that youth has the right, just as the fathers of today's young people did when they were young, to create a society and to participate in its creation. Furthermore, there has also been the experience in this regard that the vanguard nature of the LC has to be demonstrated to youth through practice, through the real vanguard activity of the communists and their basic organizations.

Thus, in discussing youth, the LC is discussing itself. This is the reason for the relevance of the positions from the LCY Program that deal with youth. In addition to the call for "comprehensive affirmation of youth in all areas of social life," the LCY Program says:

"The basis of the social education of youth is work and the mobilization of youth for the purposes and tasks of socialist construction, as well as the participation and direct responsibility of young people, even in their earliest years, in social organizations and the organs of socialist self-management, i.e. a direct link between young people and the problems of society, and concrete work resulting from the practical social conditions in which today's youth lives. Abstract lectures without a link to life cannot have an influence on the formation of the awareness of youth. Education, relying on responsible work in society, will equip youth for such work, while also forming its awareness. Since young people are educated primarily by relationships in society, the methods of education should be based on these relationships and on the position of youth in them."

The strategy in these program positions is obviously still applicable today. The LCY Program is a good reminder for us that without "comprehensive affirmation of youth in all areas of social life," and, even more importantly, without "creative activism, social responsibility, and labor discipline on the part of young citizens, who become involved through their organizations and on their own self-construction, equipping themselves to

manage social affairs"--there can be no results in resolving the vital issuance of the younger generation.

I.

One of the reasons, if we may say so, why "young people cannot get to speak" is the unemployment of a large number of qualified and highly educated members of the younger generation. This is the primary acute problem of both society and young people.

An answer to this problem has to be found. Obviously this has to do with the mistaken systemic scholastic orientation of some young people, the attempt to get any kind of diploma as quickly as possible, a diploma that becomes a piece of paper preserved for a long time before a job is found. There is a large number of unemployed people who have formal qualifications, and for whom there is very little requirement in society. All of this makes the problem of the unemployed people considerably more difficult. Many of them, as shown by research, feel themselves to be helpless and without any standing in society. This is a consequence of the fact that they are not working, creating income, or performing social tasks. Their exclusion from the world of work often makes these young people radical critics of the society in which they live, and gives rise among them to a lack of faith in the value of the self-management orientation in social development. Unemployed young people are particularly outraged by manipulations of the competition policy. For the most part, they express critical doubt regarding the realization of fraternity and unity, compensation according to work, self-management right, the right to make decisions on important social issues, the influence of young people on decisionmaking, and equal possibilities for employment.

The divisions between employed and unemployed are definitely along generational lines, since most of those unemployed are young people. We have to ask aloud why it is that those who will not work, those who are bad workers, who take away others' jobs, are not among the unemployed.

Young people, with reason, condemn several phenomena that represent a brake on the direct employment of young people. They primarily have in mind the occurrences of unnecessary work on the basis of a labor contract, the unjustified hiring of honorary colleagues, the employment of retirees, the continued employment of workers who meet the conditions for a pension, and keeping people with low qualifications in jobs that require higher qualifications. There exists a large number of poor workers and unprofessional people, and there exists also a large number of young professional people who are not working this has to be changed.

The Marxists of the 1920's believed that the "old structure" (they had in mind the bourgeois class) could not and did not succeed in satisfying them: the permanent or occasional unemployment of intellectuals was one of the typical occurrences of this inability, which assumed harsh characteristics for the youngest, if it does not offer "open horizons." On the other hand, this situation leads to "closed cadres" of a feudal-military nature, i.e. it itself causes problems that it cannot solve.

We have to take care that this position does not sound too familiar in our times. I think that it does sound that way, but that the reasons for it are new and different. In any case, we have to create, as soon as possible, a policy and practice that intellectuals, young people who have graduated from a university or a college, cannot be without work. Without this, they fall into questioning the orientation of socialist development and into questioning the orientation of socialist development and into questioning vanguardism. Without this, there truly are reasons to speak of "closed cadres" that cannot solve the modern problems of society.

It is natural that unemployed young people do not have sufficient confidence that the problem of unemployment will be solved by economic and political leaders, employment communities, and various legislative bodies. Unemployed young people do not even believe that the youth organization will resolve and solve this problem, and certain lessons should be learned from this. There is even the very interesting fact that unemployed young people have the least lack of confidence, in regard to the employment of the unemployed, in the LC. This definite faith in the LC on the part of the unemployed is a significant resource that must be utilized more thoroughly in the future. Specifically, it is necessary to increase the responsibility of the LC at all levels of organization--from the OOSK [LC basic organization] to the Central Committee--for a more comprehensive, more lasting, more realistic and practical policy for the employment of youth, with visible results, both this year and in years to come. If we are not capable of employing highly qualified and qualified young people, then we have been defeated. We need a practical policy in action: as many jobs and apartments as quickly and as cheaply as possible.

In all likelihood it will no longer be sufficient or justified to speak about the numbers of people to be employed during a year. It will be much more significant to aim at realistic strategic solutions, but ones that also function immediately in practice.

In the future, the LC will not be able to use its activity to substitute for insufficient work by factors in the economic and political systems. The greatest problem of the LC today is that the increased dynamism of the party forums is compensating for the static nature of the social system as a whole. In the future things should go in the other direction: toward creating a system for the organized employment of young people, toward increasing the responsibility of associated labor to expand the foundations for the employment of new young people, especially professional people, on a basis of greater productivity, and toward creative initiatives from organized youth to find alternative means for the employment of young people wherever associated labor can no longer do this for objective reasons. Our course should be such that we will open up jobs that from the creative and organizational standpoint will be new jobs. When not objectively necessary, we should omit from a competition the requirement for working experience, and aim for an open competition of abilities.

It is clear to all of us today that the unemployment of youth is to a considerable extent the consequence of trends in modern technology, energy

oscillations, and worldwide shortages. We are also seeing these consequences. Naturally, we also have some sources of unemployment of our own, which consist primarily of the lack of a linkage between the educational and training system, and the real personnel needs of associated labor. There is no personnel planning, and there are no real systemic grants for personnel. Therefore in the future, and even today, it will not be possible to solve the problem of unemployment through separate actions by the party, and even less so through political and moral appeals, but rather only through a long-term linkage between education and labor, and the creation of quite practical possible, and also new, transitional and alternative forms of employment.

Undoubtedly the LC still bears the responsibility in seeking and encouraging a broadening of the channels of communication between unemployed young people and associated labor in material production and in social industries. All of the vital problems of a young person should not be identified with the need for him to assume the responsibility of the elders, to enter the world of adults, since youth also has its own anthropological, human value, the same as old age—but it is also correct that unemployment is the main cause of generation revolt, trauma, and even dissatisfaction with society and its values, since young people do not know how or are unable to solve this problem. The fact that young people are not included in organized social life at the right time, that social differences affect the younger generation from education to work, leads to many ideological, political, and value consequences for the society in question.

The communists and the LC basic organizations in material production should stress the question of their responsibility for employment and the policy of accepting trainees. It is necessary to encourage assemblies of working people, worker councils, and trade union and youth organizations in collectives to be concerned with this on a continuing basis, and to break up the logic of group-property behavior, isolation, and the group egoism of the employed with respect to the young unemployed.

Communists are particularly responsible for increasing responsibility for the fate of the unemployed. It is also an integral part of the policies of economic stabilization and self-reliance. No one needs to be persuaded that this policy cannot exist without employment and the productive employment of young trained personnel. We must also overcome the situation in which many firms operate at a loss at a time when many trained professionals who could prevent this are unemployed. Significant room for solving the problem of the unemployment of young people also lies in encouraging greater utilization of existing and also new capabilities, in opening up several shift units where this is economically productive, in the further well-planned development of small-scale business, in development of the agrocomplex etc.

Here we must stress the necessity for a differentiated approach to the unemployed who are registered with the SISs (self-managing interest communities). One must keep in mind the social position as a whole, the position of the parents, and the number of those employed in the household, and distinguish the urban unemployed who have parents from those who do not.

The problem of the unemployment of young people who are qualified for social industries is very pronounced because of the stagnation in the development of these industries. There are still no lasting solutions in this regard. They have to be found. It is necessary to aim for all types of increased efficiency that do not jeopardize the quality of creativity and work. We should especially advocate retirement of the working people who meet the conditions for this and make it possible for the talented unemployed to work in the jobs that are occupied by many workers who are deserving, but are inactive today, and are not working in these jobs.

The unemployment of young people is a structural phenomenon, and it cannot be fully resolved by the logic of associated labor, even if the present economic crisis did not exist; the youth organization has to develop various forms of self-employment and youth cooperatives in social property. It is essential to allow youth and its organization to organize in accordance with its interests, and in regard to the problem of the unemployed, to seek an opportunity to establish its own self-managing factories, galleries, and bookstores, to provide intellectual services of various types, along with services of another nature, the establishment of student societies for different specialties (of students who have graduated), and cooperatives with other firms in developing some products. It is possible to use the experiences of other countries in regard to afternoon work in socialized factories, develop cooperatives in agriculture, perform various types of service work, and maintain old handicrafts. In any case, in spite of the difficulties that may be encountered in the interpretation and legal-property regulation of these forms of alternative employment, it is necessary to conduct a political campaign for solving the problems of alternative employment, a campaign that should in particular be conducted by the youth organization. This is an area for new creativity and new organization, for increasingly more developed organization of the younger generation and its organization with respect to self-employment on the basis of self-initiative and self-organization.

II.

The issue of the socioeconomic position of the younger generation cannot be reduced just to the issue of unemployment, although it is the most important. Much research, and practice itself, have shown that even when one finally crosses the threshold of labor and enters the world of the employed, the problems of the integration of the young person into society do not then cease. Many employed young people have inferior positions at work: for the same work, they receive a smaller income than their older colleagues, they often work in jobs below their qualifications, and insufficiently qualified people often hold jobs that they should not hold. There is a hierarchy in rewarding the results of work which blinds the younger generation. Younger people are often in a considerably more unfavorable position with respect to the resolution of housing questions.

It is necessary, with several systems and on a lasting basis, to resolve the issue of the housing of young workers, at least following the model for students, by the factory construction of apartments for young workers.

and the construction of new bachelor hotels, with the approval of loans. On the other hand, research data indicates that young people take sick leave more often than older workers (apparently this has to do with a "silent strike"), that they do worse in meeting the tasks (this also appears to be an expression of protest over the distribution ratios), that they frequently commit disciplinary infractions (as if making it known that the order established by the master workers over highly trained workers should be disrupted). The observation is correct that it is difficult to say what precisely what in this circle, but it is obvious that the problem of communication and the integration of young people into society still exists even for employed youth. Many young workers, because of the monopoly possessed by older professionals, are blocked in gaining professional standing. The monopoly is often held by older workers who are worn out professionally, who do not study, and do not work in accordance with the principles of the self-management organization of labor, but rather manage people.

III.

Relations in the school system, in the educational process, today more than ever before--because of the expansion of the school system, which has often been spontaneous--essentially determine the position and role of an enormous portion of the young people being educated. The natural growth of the school network, the lack of a link with associated labor, the creation of occupational specialization without regard to social needs, the supplying of diplomas not backed by real knowledge, all of these are facts that have a serious effect on the younger generation being educated, and thus on society as a whole. Because of all this, in practice opportunities are not opened up for more frequent shifts from the labor process to the educational process, there is no developed self-management school, hierarchical relations are dominant, there is no pupil or student self-management, and education is indirect, through the SIZs, linked with associated labor but not with income relations.

The announced reform of education and its implementation only in some details have not essentially changed the uncertain position and situation of the part of the younger generation that is included in the school system. We therefore feel that the assessment is correct that today the major goals of socialist upbringing and education are not much closer than when the reform began.

From the fact that education lasts too long, that it is not linked to associated labor, that there is still no real personnel planning and more rapid employment of pupils who have graduated and students who have received diplomas, etc., the possibility arises, and is available to some young people, that they can participate in the school system all the way to their thirties, or even longer. This postpones their inclusion in the labor process. The consequences for society and for the position of such people are clear.

The finding is correct that the economic difficulties of recent years, accompanied by an increase in the number of unemployed and a decrease in the

rate of employment, have certainly objectively slowed achievement of the goals of the education reform. But in addition to this objective factor, there is also very conscious resistance to reforming the old bourgeois school. In fact, the criticism of the reform, the nature of this criticism, reveals that the traditionalist petty bourgeois strata are not suited by the new school, a school linked with associated labor and social needs. They are suited by the traditional status school, a school retaining hierarchical relations in which the instructor's authority is inviolate and the students are obedient.

A concrete reform program is not being carried out in higher education either. Many deadlines passed long ago. This is by no means accidental. There are still people in the university who have longed for the old institutionalized faculty sufficient unto itself, "a higher school of national interest, removed from dirty social practice and its pragmatic demands."

It is obvious that the reform of the university and its integration into a unified system of guided education cannot be postponed to some indefinite time. Also, the present changes in secondary guided education will not acquire their true meaning unless a unified system of guided education is created, with complete upward mobility for all professions and occupations.

It is necessary to create a plan of quite concrete action for the reform of the university. It cannot be conducted through discussions that do not end with any obligations either for the communists or for higher school organs and bodies. We must, in fact, fight for a guided school, a school linked to associated labor, which provides a real possibility for employment of the pupils, a possibility that they may be included, from work, in the educational process at some higher level. Higher education must be derived naturally from a unified system of guided education, and consequently a radical war must be waged against all those who, because of their own narrow interests, are halting this process. In practice we must strengthen the concept of education along with work and for work, as well as the concept of permanent education. It must be deliberately linked with the existing and possible needs of social development. We must necessarily radically overcome the gap between what is being taught today in the guided school and what will be studied later on. It is necessary to remove all foundations for doubt that the knowledge acquired may not be productive in work, so that knowledge will be acquired together with work and in addition to work. In particular, we must be resolutely against all calculating attitudes with respect to future work; people's abilities must be developed quite concretely and everyone must be given the opportunity to prove these abilities in action and to affirm them further. We must also constantly keep in mind the concept of education for the future, not tying it to pragmatic considerations, but rather to strategic social needs; we must free education from parental or family expectations, and give it a more youthful coloring. The degree of education in the future will not necessarily have to coincide with education for work.

In any case, we must surmount the chasm between the school system and society, education and life, intellectual and manual labor; education for

young people should not be simply a loss of time, but rather a true human, intellectual and professional advancement, appreciated as such by society. Where people do not make a living by working or where people live well and easily without work or on the basis of someone else's work, in such a society the school does not even need social authority. We have to be resolute against such relations and affirm the broader values of education.

IV.

It is known that in times of crisis, of stagnation in social development, a battle begins over the soul of the younger generation. This time is favorable for the manipulation of young people by advocates of anticommunist and nationalistic ideas, bourgeois and statehood ideologies, for inroads by alien values and the consumer culture. Unfortunately, parts of our mass media, among other things, are educating our youth to petty-bourgeois and bourgeois views of life's values; young people are assaulted with all sorts of commercially produced Orwellian fears, irrational predictions of cataclysms, the forlornness of the people of this planet of ours. When one adds to all of this dry and indifferent bureaucratic words, gloomy and barren speeches about our social situation, various defeatist clamors about the state of this society, some politicians' games with limited awareness, partialization and divisions--then it becomes clearer what the awareness and senses of our younger generation are exposed to.

The LC, together with an enormous portion of the antinationalistically-oriented youth, must resolutely oppose attempts by nationalists to pass their conservative, regressive, and antihumanist ideas on to youth. Let us not conceal the fact that part of youth, fortunately the smaller part, has yielded to the onslaught of nationalism. The nationalists are trying to bring youth, which naturally belongs to the 20th century, back to the 19th, to the darkness of nationalist exclusivisms, narrow tribal awareness, the ideologies of blood and soil. Nationalism is a well-known ideology of divisions and schisms, the ideology of national myths and conspiracies about wounds and blood, an ideology that is decaying, dividing, distancing, reducing human awareness to the awareness of the flock.

For the sake of illustration, youth is offered, in the name of theatrical culture, mythological ideas about the Serbian nation; kings and generals are glorified, and not the people and its national liberation aspirations and struggle. The altered Stalinism of the party is mocked, that is, the only party that radically and openly opposed and is opposing Stalinism; there is a shallow politicization aimed at dividing the peoples in Yugoslavia. Some young people have succumbed to the unitarist or separatist concept of nationalism. At the same time, it is precisely the socialist-oriented youth that are showing themselves to be very combative and responsible in criticizing nationalism. All of this clearly indicates that the LC must rely on youth in the struggle that it is conducting against nationalism. In the long term, this battle actually cannot be won without youth. The battle for communist awareness, against the inertia of the Chetnik, Ustasa, irredentist, and all other nationalist awarenesses, must be presented only by the communists and youth. In joint ideological and

political action. Youth continually has an open challenge from all progressive forces of society to go resolutely into battle against nationalism both among youth and in society as a whole.

There is an increasing number of people who, in the name of culture, art, science, or historiography, actually promote a politicized approach to the past. How is this reflected? Primarily in the fact that patriotism and nationalism are shifted from our recent revolutionary history and modern times into the remote past; it is claimed that it was only then and exclusively then that patriotism was expressed and consequently, skipping over the sordid interval, it is necessary to return to it. Here the past, history--obviously--is being imposed on our contemporaries, including young people, as a substitute for modern times in which there is no room for values, for human struggle, for humanity, and as a replacement for responsibility to one's time. It is obvious that there is a deliberate promotion of a cultist attitude toward the "glorious national past," not just for its own sake, but rather in order to devalue our socialist revolution, to settle accounts with the communist movement and its role in the creation of the nation and the state. Youth is called upon, in accordance with its feelings for what is national and for Yugoslav self-managing socialist patriotism, and on the other hand unitarist Yugoslavism, to participate in the direct struggle against these sowers of human hatred, the falsifiers of both the past and the present, the false emissaries of our nations, who reduce our peoples only to small parts of their "glorious past" and separate them from their own socialist idea and revolution.

Organized youth in our society should be among the first to wage war against false and artificial values, against the petty bourgeois way of life, against various types of trash and rubbish, against the concept and practice that one can live well without working. This war should be public and radical, especially since false values are being imposed from our legal institutions, from some TV programs, from certain columns in our press, from part of the entertainment world, and recently also from some classical and traditional cultural institutions. Who is it that has been boldest recently in bringing trash before the public? It is not very difficult to answer this question. It is a group of nonworkers, managers among so-called "artists," and the alleged "esteemed audience," people who do everything they can to enrich themselves, and they are succeeding in this, by mediating between the low-taste trained audience and low, trashy segments of the so-called new national artists. Young people, with the help of the IC, are tasked and called upon to raise questions in public and to obtain answers to them: Why there is so much trash on some radio and television programs; why people who systematically, and very often for private interests, promote trash in the press, radio, and television, and maintain certain interest groups in a monopolistic position, can retain their jobs as journalists; why there are no young, talented people, young researchers, artists, talented young pupils, students, singers and musicians on radio and television programs; why continually, it is mostly professionals and entertainers who are guests on various TV programs, and even on some news programs, admittedly more earlier than is the case today. This has to be changed; creative young people must take over all jobs where creation is necessary and natural.

The situation among youth is often better than is the case with youth and student institutions and with the youth leadership. Youth and student cultural institutions in particular are exposed to manipulation by politicized guilds in culture, since it is felt--mistakenly, we are convinced--that support will be found there for nationalistic ideas, for unitarist and separatist concepts of society, for conduct contrary to unity, for false-radicalistic and essentially dogmatic ideas. Youth is not providing this support, but rather groups of aged officials of these publishing houses, who are politicizing their noncreative social position and becoming open to program contents, forums, and dramas from the people who are in their mature and advanced years and who are politically suited by manipulation of some of the young people.

It is necessary to work much more deliberately on having youth return from the street to its school halls, to play, creation, sports, and vacations, to have students return to their centers and to have them, and no one else, determine the measure and content of what is modern, vanguard, and authentic. Particular attention, even more than today, should be devoted to the youth mass information media. They should be a continually open school for the involved critical and communist youth with respect to values, journalism, and public advocacy. More than in the past, youth should be included further in the "Young Researchers" and in the entirety of scientific life, and they should be allowed to work in unused libraries and scientific laboratories. It is also of particular significance for young people to take control to a greater extent over their own work actions, to give them a new spirit, a spirit that is proper for modern times, new initiatives that are not associated only with physical labor, to take control of their own organizations such as Gorani, youth holiday associations, athletic societies, and many other organizations. The LC can provide direct support and encouragement in this regard.

V.

The issue of the socialist orientation of the younger generation--this is now obvious--is becoming increasingly more complex in our modern conditions. It is no longer enough just to say that it is necessary to get rid of mistaken views that youth is automatically becoming socialist through the mere fact that it is living in a socialist society, that we cannot leave youth to the spontaneous process of upbringing, and that consequently the obligation of communists and all socialist forces is to act in a sensible and organized manner to educate the younger generation in socialism. In times of an economic and social crisis, the wearying of self-management, a certain decline in the vanguard nature of the LC, the waning of revolutionary changes, it is increasingly more difficult to fight for the socialist orientation of the younger generation.

One more fact is very vital when people speak today about the value orientations of the younger generation, especially the urban. That young people remain outside the world of labor too long, especially at a time of new media that make communication international, creates a particular creative marginality among some of the urban younger generation, a certain

generational indifference, various forms of alternative behavior and culture a search for different kinds of refuge, holding themselves at a distance, forming their own worlds, etc.

Under the conditions of a social crisis, it is natural that part of youth cannot cope, does not know what road to follow, or what it should support. In the younger generation today, because of the contradictions in its status in society, there is an immanent rebellion against the rational; it seeks music, and not the music that is heard, but rather the one that one "lives" by, that is a refuge. It seeks places that are not under the control of adults, it seeks a greater degree of freedom of research, living together, love. A new form of dialogue, a rejection of patriarchal pressures and authoritarianism, is appearing between parents and children, due to the position of the young people and to their way of life. In fact, they are seeking new "projects for life" that are outside the traditional ideologies and systems of values. In addition to this, as we have already stressed, young people live in a world of new media, mass media, which establish a sort of forum for young people that has national or international dimensions. The values that young people consider their own spread so very quickly that this results, among other things, in certain types of a separate alternative culture of young people, a free fashion of cheap materials, all as a form of protest against the interest and class games in the relationships of their elders, against totalitarianism and hegemony.

Many analysts of modern life among young people speak correctly about a certain emotional revolution in the life of the young urban generation, about certain of its attempts to create a project of nonobligatory hedonism and a horizontal community without a hierarchy, which is maintained with the aid of several codes of collective sensibility. It is necessary to know--these analysts say--that young people have first of all decided in favor of speed, ease of passage, life without metaphysical and utopian frills, an eternal present, a game that will not be hampered by the old ones who are "responsible" for young people having to "play" until they are 30 years old.

The prolonged youth about which we correctly speak results in certain anarchistic, hedonistic, and cultural-pessimistic orientations, as phenomena of urban youth culture. Writing on the walls is not vandalism, as the "ancient patriarchs" think, but rather an attempt at a forcible breakthrough into society, calling attention to young people who, without work, have grown too old to write on the blackboard. Slogans on the walls are a sort of mirror of society, an activity of young people when they do not have any other activity.

Social contradictions, emotional tension, and social fragmentation have an effect on unique styles in youth culture, and on their differentiation in accordance with these styles. The industry of goods and consciousness also adapts to this youth subculture. Some young people dedicate themselves to different types of committed protest. Others dedicate themselves to being irrational fans, and still others to various musical gatherings as a way of life. There are also various styles in clothing.

It is also necessary to mention that the position of modern youth, its extended schooling, and the postponement of the moment when the young person will be employed, expand in a special way the spiritual horizon of young people--they become separate, they form a sort of process of self-education, they give a sort of scope to their imagination, and they become a privileged class of dreamers.

It was not by chance that young people quickly espoused Tito's idea "revolution is something different from ordinary peaceful life." They do not want this ordinary, peaceful life that is promoted so stubbornly by the petty bourgeoisie. They do not want either authoritarian fathers or professors, they do not want a false hierarchy, self-appointed ideological leaders and manipulators. They believe with reason that "the productive worker is a dreamer," that awareness must and can be changed only in a community of knowledge, labor, creativity, dreams, and communist action.

It is precisely for this reason that we must sharply oppose the small number of professors, unsuccessful politicians, who manipulate part of the student youth, wanting to be its leaders along the line of a petty-political interpretation of the present social situation, to oppose student youth to its own organization and the LC along the lines of a political partnership or alternativism.

Some young people are making the LC increasingly more responsible for the degree of its vanguard nature and its guidance of the political and economic system as it is really is in practice. Still another group of young people--usually because of unemployment, the environment of privatism, and the erosion of socialist morality--goes out and seeks solutions in various forms of leftwing or rightwing radicalism. This is the group of young people that most easily yields to manipulations of a political nature, and to various forms of blackmail on this basis. Finally, this is also the part of the younger generation that either is involved in alternative forms of life in society (though entertainment, music, or in another manner), or is seized by the pragmatist element, business-psychology (which they certainly learned from someone), the profit-centered entertainment world. At the same time, part of youth--let us say this at once--also isolated from the youth population as a whole, so-called youth officials, play at copying some of the older careerist officials, repeat their election games, rush after privileges, the demonstrative and formal representation of youth, and deal very little and sometimes not at all with the issues of the life, work, position, activity, creation, and values of young people. Radical changes are needed here. In the future the youth leadership should be selected and assessed according to the actions being conducted, and not according to formal elections not backed by the results expressed in their work.

It is necessary to state clearly here that youth is most affected by the predominance of regionalistic criteria: regional education, regional employment, and regional prospects. Obviously this has to do with a political and ideological small-town spirit, a partialization of awareness, values, activities, trends, a blockade of broader initiatives and cooperation, a grasping of one's own shop door. The LC must respect this

reasonable, rational, and necessary resistance from young people, and must put itself at the head of it, along with the actions being initiated by young people themselves in their own organization and in the LC.

VI.

Many things indicate that the LC does not have well developed methods of work with youth, given the way that the League of Socialist Youth is formed, with active forums and a passive membership and a youth that is more or less left to its own spontaneous organization. We need changes here. First of all, it is necessary to encourage the LC basic organization, during important ideological and political actions, especially those pertaining to productivity, the modern self-managing organization of labor, the development of new technology, exports, distribution in accordance with work, cadres, the employment of trainees, etc., to hold joint meetings of communists and the youth organization where there is one, and where there is none then with youth organization members, and to agree on the courses of action in which most of the youth will be included and on who will be responsible for them. The communists have not done so. In the future they will have to: it is necessary to go together with youth into production battles, and into ideological and political ones. Another course of action is revival of the youth organizations, especially in the basic organizations of associated labor and in local communities, and having them linked more directly to all subjective and creative factors in the milieu in which they are active. The work programs have to be vital ones, from the concrete milieu in which the people are living and working, and that is where the programs have to be carried out.

We must state that the party, the communists, and the OOSK cannot win the important battles of the time in which we live unless they include in these battles the younger generation, the generation for which self-management, at least ideologically, is its mother tongue. For example, in many collectives, because of resistance from older people, OOSKs do not have the strength to conduct a campaign to replace irresponsible leaders, remove the idle, bring in capable younger personnel, resolve the issues of exports, reorientation, the introduction of new technology and the advancement of the organization of labor. In all of these collectives, the OOSKs should call upon and mobilize youth and perform this important work through joint political action. There can be no solution without a struggle anywhere, and not here either.

The LC will not be able to win the battle for stabilization, one of the most important battles of our time, unless it includes youth in it in a comprehensive manner. All of the OOSKs should be responsible, together with the youth organization, for comprehensively acquainting young people with the real goals of stabilization, so that they realize immediately that these goals are also their goals. It is important in this regard to state in particular that actually, the resolution of almost all the vital material, existential, and even political and ideological-value issues of the younger generation will depend on how the implementation of the long-term economic stabilization program actually proceeds. Consequently, we also think that

it is important for most of youth to be included in the implementation of this policy in practice. The youth leaderships do not have any work more pressing than developing plans and organization, and mobilization of youth in the city, the village, the factory, the school, the university, and the local community. Communists must give direct support to them in this.

It is necessary to implement a policy of continuing admission of youth into the LC: at least twice a year, the OOSKs should deal with the admission of young people, and in the meantime they should work continually with youth and among youth. We have to agree that the election of young people for our delegate system cannot be left to chance and random developments, but rather that young people should be elected, in a greater percentage than their participation in social life, precisely in order to surmount the present situation in which youth is insufficiently present in political and social life.

There can be no social affirmation of our youth unless the League of Socialist Youth itself participates in equipping young people for responsible participation in the system of self-managing democracy. The political subjectiveness of the younger generation is not being implemented, under our conditions, through some separate ideological and political movement for young people, but rather through attempts by the League of Socialist Youth [SSO] not to exert pressure on society with respect to ideological parallelism, but rather to equip young people for daily decisionmaking on social problems.

Young people, both by themselves and with the support of the LC, should participate in the mainstream of the social revolution as an integral and active factor, and not as the passive object of educational activity. We have to go beyond pessimistic theories: how youth is being apoliticized, and shifting its interest to the prosaic issues of the standard of living and entertainment, how the discrepancy between the revolutionary romanticism of the Skojev epoch and today's "social detachment" of youth and its worship of the Idols of music and film is extremely disturbing, and the increasingly more pronounced apathetic disinterest in politics in general.

First of all, the youth organization itself and the LC should make a decisive turnaround, and devote a great deal of work to a serious investigation of the true attitudes and perceptions of youth and its problems, as the primary and most significant ideological issue, on which the continuity and further development of the heritage of our revolution depend. "The attitude toward youth" or "the youth problem" is a problem affecting the very social existence of the LC, its development, and its attitude toward itself and society as a whole. If the youth organization and the LC continue to ignore the interests and new needs of young people and do not react quickly enough to signs of anxiety and anger, young people can only act outside of and against the organizations and institutions that have been separated from them. But this can be overcome, and already is being overcome by the actions that the LC is conducting.

I think that today's younger generation should take what is right from the revolution of their fathers—the class orientation that leads to full human

and national freedoms; they should take the sources and swift currents, but not everything that is being offered as the heritage of the revolution and is not. Young people should not be asked to understand the heritage of the revolution as the participants in the revolution did. It is essential for them to bear its basic spirit: combativeness, criticism, solidarity, a desire for society to advance.

The LC organization should become a young one to an even greater extent, both through the number of young people in it, and through its fighting for the rights of young people to ideals, to visions, to changes, but also to a real satisfaction of their material and social needs--from employment and housing to participation in self-management and social decision-making. In fact, the LC should take the lead in strengthening the political activism of young people, and greater participation by them in self-management and management. This is the right way for this revolution to have a natural continuity, and also be enriched by the new revolutionary approach and creativity of young people.

9909
CSO: 2800/436

ZAGREB UNIVERSITY STUDENTS' POLITICAL PASSIVITY EXAMINED

Zagreb VJESNIK in Serbo-Croatian 5 Aug 84 p 4

[Article by Milan Jaksic: "Why Are Students Passive?"]

[Text] Only about 1,000 students (out of 40,000) are active. A check of the party is obviously necessary, but how to carry it out? The goal: the interests of students, schools and associated labor must coincide. Then it will be easier to determine and carryout party action.

It seems that students have never been politically as passive as in the last few years. According to the data recently presented at the session of the Zagreb CK SKH, only about 1,000 out of 40,000 University of Zagreb students are active in the SK organizations and in the League of Socialist Youth. What else can be concluded on the basis of such indicators except that this institution of higher education needs a thorough party census. The question is just how to carry it out?

There is no longer any dilemma whether the former University Committee should be brought back to the top of the university party pyramid. This nostalgic reconnection--prompted mostly by the desire for some kind of institutional homogenization of the SK at the University, so that it might gather party members around itself as a hen gathers her chick--long ago yielded to essentially different deliberations.

Briefly, vertical linking has yielded a large part of its concessions to the so-called party dispersion which has its points of support in the entire network of initiatives present in the very foundations of the League of Communists. However, what has happened in the meantime? The attempts to disperse somehow the power of the SK have not been particularly successful, and the inclination to some type of stronger vertical links is not entirely without sense, but without the right of decision along this vertical line, as this inclination is usually justified.

Experiences

The experience of various schools and dormitories is certainly interesting, because if we took some (indeed rare) good experiences with party work as

an example to others, and there is a basis for such a thing, solutions obviously exist, especially when we speak of experience deriving from linking the schools with associated labor, or generally of a curriculum which would offer as realistic prospects as possible to young people.

However, the analysis we obtained at the Trnje SED Committee indicates the extremes which certainly must be analyzed. On the one hand, the schools of electronics, shipbuilding, and marine technology have very good party organizations, while at the school of letters the situation is completely different. Out of the total number of 1,600 registered students at the school of electronics, the active party and youth core consists of about 300 students, at the school of marine technology it consists of 200 out of 1,200, and at the school of letters only about 20 students take care of youth activities, while the majority of the 78 members are inactive, although there are about 400 SED members among the students and about 110 among the faculty.

To this we add that sociopolitical activity in dormitories is even weaker, almost completely halted. Thus it turns out that future key personalities in our economy and social services, and various experts will have, upon the completion of their studies, a spiritual void which, by inner logic, must exert a negative influence on the sociopolitical commitment of those people in their subsequent life and work. The essential question is, what are the causes of such a situation?

Parallels

At the above-mentioned session of the Presidency of the Zagreb SED it was emphasized that the causes exist not so much in methods as in the content of the work, and it was noted that neither party nor youth organizations in these circles are concerned with the students' vital problems. As one of the participants in the discussion said, "One cannot win over the students with phony topics."

It is therefore interesting to see what the communists at the school of electronics discuss when they manage to meet (in a creative way). They mostly talk about their future profession (and the professors about their present one), or about the best way of preparing for that profession, certainly not neglecting the opportunity to consult with the associated labor so that the school will not create a surplus labor in society.

They also discuss student regulations. It is known that the students at this school must complete their program each year, i.e. they cannot postpone exams for the next year and thus prolong their study, and the schools of marine technology and shipbuilding follow the same system, while the regulations at the school of letters are quite different: there you can postpone exams and prolong their time as students.

One might say that such parallels are interesting because of different approaches (or generally because of different intentions to do something like this) in the formation of the students' self-awareness, either in

relation to their future career, their future profession, or to themselves as people who are in a serious period of their spiritual lives during their studies.

The self-awareness of the power of their future profession or of the knowledge they acquire will grow at an intensity proportional to the intensity of work on common programs organized by schools together with associated labor, when it is realized that such specialized knowledge acquires (or will acquire one day) a concrete purpose and a palpable result.

If we add to this the rather realistic knowledge of good employment opportunities after the completion of the studies--and the stronger the cooperation of the educational institution with associated labor, the better the opportunities for the student to get a job after graduation--we will in such cases have quite a concrete party action.

Thus it is not accidental that party secretaries at the school of electronics, are as a rule excellent students, while in some other schools party secretaries are not good students. This disparity is interesting for several reasons and above all because it tells, on the one hand, about the exceptional significance attributed to party functions, and on the other, about the neglect of this significance.

High grades are in this case a result not only of the knowledge acquired in the literal sense but also of a study program which makes everybody make the maximum effort in order to complete the study successfully. Thus only the most persistent, diligent, conscientious and gifted remain. High grades are also the result of a labor differentiation which, as we have said, is not strictly limited by the academy. It is the result of young people realizing that success achievable only with hard work and purposeful efforts is not futile.

The intention in such cases is obvious: the best people are given party positions so that the curricula with all the stated characteristics will gain in importance, and technological innovations or the entire span of the specialized knowledge will receive the proper social verification. In such situations, the party position and the entire party action is a component part of studying as a whole, which is unique organism.

Burdens

The school of letters has had problems with its organization for years. The curriculum itself is rather heterogeneous, with many various departments and a series of other problems well known to the public. It is true that it is difficult to transfer the model of party organization from one school to another, because it is objectively easier for the school of electronics to establish links with associated labor than it is for the school of letters and in this way form the party action. But it is obvious that this school also needs more efficient links with our social reality.

When party activists from the Trnje OK SKH asked a professor from the school of letters for his opinion on the reasons for the communists' passivity

at this school, he quoted three causes: one that can be put within the span of a certain number of people (he thinks that their number is not large) who do not like our social system, then people's egoism, the I-do-not-care behavior, where individuals "mind only their own business," and finally the feeling of a certain number of students and professors that they cannot exert any essential influence on anything.

The label of leftism, which has properly been given to a number of professors at this school (although we are not dealing here with leftism only as a political vice) seems to burden this school like an unavoidable mortgage rather than stimulate it to a decisive political differentiation. There is so much procrastination with this differentiation that in a way it contributes to often-false allusions to the school which, looked at in this way, finds itself on the other side of our society's barricades, which is not true if we take into account the small number of people at this school who have unacceptable ideas about our social reality. The impression arises that political (and not only political) problems at this school should be solved by somebody else, by society as such, and not by the working people of this collective.

The social community certainly must do a lot more in order to put the School of Letters on a sound basis, but when we are dealing with the organization of scientific work and instruction, outlining party action there, or with a whole series of other internal problems at this institution, the school itself should make a greater effort.

As far as the School of Letters is concerned, it is indispensable to destroy the myth of the political incapacity of this institution, a myth that is sometimes propagated by higher political levels, and the school itself certainly should deny such views. This means that people there should not always resist the outside criticism if it is well founded, in the same way as the social community should react to the fact that assistant professors at this school have relatively low salaries.

The party organization there, such as it is (we have seen that it is weak) simply has no basis. Because of the way this school is organized, young peoples' motivation for party work is proportionate to their chances of getting a job after the completion of their studies.

Inactivities

There is one more problem in relation to the party efficiency at the University of Zagreb. A certain number of party members are lost when they enter the university, or at the end of their studies. Many students when registering do not establish links with the new party organization, and graduates often simply disappear from the party scene, in the same way as they disappear from lectures. This problem certainly cannot be solved by creating a special university service which would trace party members, but it seems to us that it is very harmful to accept the thesis that one must not count with those who do not want to link because it means that they are not interested in the membership in the SK.

The school in such situations should in fact be a lure to the new students. It is true that nobody can be kept in the SK by persuasion, but the example of the School of Electronics, that we have already mentioned here, will certainly have a stimulative action not only on the new students who are SK members, but also on those who would join the party later.

We could therefore say that the thesis that one cannot essentially influence the decisions in a given environment (milieu) is sometimes the consequence of party inactivity rather than its cause. Students often pronounce this thesis when they are asked why they are not active in dormitories. They usually say the reason is they cannot influence decisions on lodging, food, etc. It is appropriate to ask the question: Why are there no serious deliberations on linking schools with students' dormitories?

If this link is made, dormitories will participate in instruction (with indispensable conditions for studying, drawing, reading...), and this means that they can participate in the entire instruction-work cycle. Associated labor can add its contribution to the students' standards, but not by means of classic allocations out of income, as up to now, but by knowing exactly where the common interests of students, work organizations, and schools which train the students for work organizations coincide. If all these interests coincide, it is easier to plan party action.

12455

CSO: 2800/444

END

**END OF
FICHE**

DATE FILMED

21 Sept 1984